

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XXIII. No. 15
WHOLE No. 546

July 31, 1920

PRICE, 10 CENTS
{\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	337-340
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Daniel Mannix, Apostle of Liberty—Holland's New School Law—The British War Exhibition—The Allies and Catholic Missions	
—The K. of C. Supreme Convention.....	341-350
COMMUNICATIONS	350-351
EDITORIALS	
Mr. Bryan and the Vatican—Free the Debtor Too—Shooting Straight—Centralization and the Smith-Towner Bill—Body and Soul of Literature—Stupid Propaganda.....	352-354
LITERATURE	
Is O. Henry "The American Maupassant"?—Reviews—Books and Authors.....	355-357
EDUCATION	
The School Fight in Michigan.....	358-359
SOCIOLOGY	
Was Adam a Cave Man?.....	358-359
NOTE AND COMMENT.....	359

Chronicle

Home News.—In his speech of acceptance the Republican Presidential nominee declared against the League of Nations. He framed his opposition to the

Senator Harding's Acceptance present covenant in these words: "In the call of the conscience of America is peace, peace that closes the gaping wound of world war and silences the impassioned voices of international envy and distrust. Heeding this call and knowing as I do the disposition of the Congress, I promise you formal and effective peace so quickly as a Republican Congress can pass its declaration for a Republican executive to sign."

He continued by declaring that no one man is big enough to run this nation. There never was one and there never will be. He moreover guaranteed that he would restore "constitutional government and invite the cordial cooperation by Congress in the conduct of government." Armaments should be reduced, so that the

burdens of peace-loving peoples will be less. He laid the blame for failure in making peace with Germany on the "assumption, obstinacy, impracticability of the Wilson Administration," and promised to find a way "to do our part, neither covetous because of ambition, nor hesitant because of fear, but ready to serve ourselves, humanity and God." Humanity is in a ferment. The Red Terror has spread far and wide, and sowers of discord hope to light its torch in America. "America must not only save herself, but be the appealing voice to sober the world." Production must be the watchword of the hour. Consumer, wage-earner and producer will receive full protection from the Republican party which is opposed to Government operation of industries and transportation, as it is opposed to Government ownership. As the Constitution recognizes neither class nor group the Republican party scorns to appeal to group citizenship for political advantage. The present Administration "had debased the dollar in reckless finance." It is the purpose of the Republican party to apply correctives to the high cost of living, and the depreciation of Liberty bonds, and to promote thrift and economy in the administration of government. His party, he continued, is for a high protective tariff, a merchant marine, an ample navy and a small army. He pledged himself and his party to procure fuller protection for the colored citizens of the nation. There must be greater safeguards legally enacted against immigration, a firmer policy toward Mexico, and rigid enforcement of existing laws. "People will ever differ about the wisdom of the enactment of a law. There is a divided opinion about the Eighteenth Amendment, but there can be no difference of opinion about honest law enforcement." Modification or repeal is within the power of the people, but perversion or evasion would only defeat the purpose of Government.

Foreign Wars.—War is still going on merrily both in Europe and Asia. Greece is pushing Turkey as hard as possible and France is active in Syria. On July 24 the Greek forces in Thrace occupied Eski-Baba, the junction-point of the Constantinople and Kirk-Kilisseeh Railroad. They immediately pushed on to Adrianople and attacked the city which fell into their hands, the Turks offering but slight resistance. While this was taking

place in Europe. Asia, too, was in a turmoil. On July 25, the French under General Gouraud occupied Damascus, the seat of the government of Emir Feisal, King of Syria. The capture of the city followed a stiff battle in which Yussuf Azim, Minister of War in Feisal's cabinet, was killed. Two days before the French had captured Aleppo so that now they hold the main railroad line north into Cilicia. According to a special cable to the *New York Times*, the story of this late trouble is as follows:

On July 20 it was announced that Feisal had accepted the terms of Gouraud's ultimatum, which called for recognition of the Arab army. But on the next day, the official acceptance not having reached Gouraud, he ordered his troops to move ahead both on Aleppo and Damascus. On the morning of July 22 the Emir sent a messenger to Gouraud to say that the acceptance had been dispatched within the time limit and that its non-arrival was due to an accident. Gouraud accepted this excuse and halted his troops, which were advancing from Zahle to Damascus. But on the afternoon of the same day, east of Kalah, a troop of 400 of Feisal's cavalry attacked a French detachment guarding the Homs-Tripoli railroad junction. At the same time French aviators reported the massing of troops between the French and Damascus. To the north Arabs were reported marching toward the French near Aleppo.

Yesterday morning, July 24, Gouraud learned that in the defile through the mountain range which separates the Plain of Bekku from that of Damascus a large force of Feisal's troops were in position and that Yussuf Azim had arrived at Kham Maisolun. General Gouraud ordered General Goybet, in immediate command, to attack.

The French troops met the Sheriffjan troops armed with machine guns and field cannon. The French troops were composed of white infantry, Algerian riflemen, African chasseurs, with Moroccans and Senegalese.

The French are particularly incensed against Feisal because he accepted from them 80,000,000 francs and then attacked them. An unconfirmed report has it that Emir Said will be King of Syria.

France is evidently beset with difficulties, not the least of which are in Europe, for the Bolsheviks are now in a position to march to the Rhine, if they desire to do so.

France.—The sinister machinations which the Masonic influence and anti-clerical cliques are resorting to in order to frustrate the purpose that the French Government still

entertains of renewing relations with the Holy See are becoming more apparent.

Their definite aim is to cause delay and thus gain the time they need to confuse the real issue. Their devious ways in attempting to effect this last vary to the point of manifest inconsistency. A resolution adopted by the central committee of the *Ligue des Droits de l'Homme* and recommended to the attention of democratic and labor organizations attempts to establish the two following points alleged as facts: From the point of view of the external relations of France the Holy See does not constitute a political power. For France there exists but one truly legal power at Rome which is

that of the Italian Government. The appointment of an ambassador at the Vatican would inevitably arouse the legitimate suspicions of the Italian people and thus contribute to a maintenance of that misunderstanding among the nations of Europe which brought on the war. Secondly, from the point of view of internal affairs the law of separation of Church and State, which the *Ligue de Droits de l'Homme* claims to have largely sponsored, has, if we are to believe this resolution, established a regime of freedom of conscience. According to the terms of the law the Government of the Republic does not recognize any cult or furnish it financial assistance. Hence it would be contrary to the stipulation of the law to reestablish diplomatic relations with the Vatican under the pretext of defending the political interests of France. The central committee therefore adjures all not to renounce the benefits of the law of separation instinct with the hybrid liberal principles of the French Revolution, or, as it calls them correctly, "the purest principles of the Declaration of 1789."

Quite in contrast with this, yet no less disingenuous, are the methods of the anti-clerical press. "*L'Oeuvre*," commenting on the adjournment of the Finance Committee, attempted to make capital of the event by grossly insinuating that if M. Noblemaire, who is known to favor the reestablishment of relations, could suggest postponement of the discussion it must have been because some Ultramontane influence had caused confusion at the Vatican, and the Pope no longer knew his own mind. A letter from Cardinal Gaspari that should have been sent to M. Millerand but was not, is then conjured up out of the realm of pure imagination and a grave difference of opinion between Cardinal Amette and Cardinal Andrieu is arbitrarily excogitated for the sheer purpose of putting the Pope and the French clergy in the wrong.

In reference to such views as these the "*Libre Parole*" says:

We are witnessing the last convulsions of anti-religious sectarianism, already violently shaken by the rapprochement now existing between the Government of France and the Holy See. A new incident has arisen in regard to the Finance Committee which threatens to retard for some time its due solution. Delay upon delay, this is all that Freemasonry is seeking for the moment in the same way as is Germany.

M. Charles Maurras, who is not a Catholic, declares in "*L'Action Française*": "This is not the moment to make a display of anti-religious and anti-national intrigue in order to give them shape and significance in the eye of the universe." In "*L'Echo de Paris*" M. Pichon characterizes the authors of false reports and misinterpretations as "leaders in a perfidious campaign." "But they know," he asserts, "that unless they succeed in casting on the Holy See and the French clergy the odium of a great refusal or of some signal duplicity their last hope of avoiding a triumphal vote in the Chamber and its ratification in the Senate will vanish completely"; and he

concludes that "only a very feeble cause could be forced to defend itself by artifice and resort to such mean devices."

Ireland.—A trustworthy correspondent of AMERICA made a thorough and impartial investigation of the Derry riots, and sent the following results of his study:

The Riots

1. When the Carsonite volunteers became in 1914 battalions of the Ulster Division of the new army for France, they did not give up their German rifles,

machine guns, etc. They were armed with the British army weapons, Lee Enfield rifles and Vickers M-guns. But all the German stuff went into their stores. The Government more than once talked of seizing these armories, but has never done so. These are the weapons that somehow got into the hands of the Orange fighters at Derry. 2. There has long been peace and good will in Derry, where this year a Catholic majority was returned to the City Council and a Catholic mayor elected. On Corpus Christi there was a procession in the streets which could not have happened if the local Protestant body had been hostile. Of course the local Orangemen would likely be hostile, but they are a minority of the Protestants. 3. Derry is divided into two parts by the river Foyle. A lot of work is done at the railway stations and quays on the right bank. But most of the workers live on the other shore in the city. The trouble was begun by an armed party of Orangemen occupying the bridge one afternoon, just before the workers began to go home. Catholics were turned back at the muzzle of rifles and pistols, Protestants let through. The Catholics began to use boats at the ferries to get home. They were fired on. Now all agree that the police took no action. It is quite certain that if armed Sinn Fein men had held the bridge, an inspector with a score of carbine armed men would have appeared within an hour, and cleared the bridge, firing on the party that held it if they would not go. 4. With the police inactive, and the Orangemen firing on the Catholics, sporadic disturbances began. But the Sinn Fein volunteers do not appear to have intervened as an organized force till the rioting was well advanced. They then held against an attack that continued for some hours, St. Columba's College and the Bishop's house (on the northwest side of the city). All the papers agree that the police and troops were strangely inactive. One would have expected them to go to the rescue of the besieged buildings. The appearance of one armored car and a platoon would have stopped the fight. They did nothing until the attack had been repelled and the Sinn Fein Volunteers were driving the Orange mob back into the Protestant quarter. They then came up and fired on the Sinn Fein men, i. e., intervened to cover the retreat of the attacking force. 5. Several papers say that it was puzzling to see the military allowing rifle-armed parties to pass through their cordons. 6. In the Protestant quarter the armed Orangemen turned Catholics out of their houses and sacked the houses. In the Catholic quarter up to yesterday Sinn Fein parties were posted to protect the houses of Protestants in Catholic neighborhoods. This points to the organized Sinn Fein force having acted on the defensive. 7. A Sinn Fein guard held the local whiskey distillery to prevent plunder and drunkenness. Two men caught trying to steal whiskey were flogged. One more indication that the Catholics were trying to preserve order.

The military appear now to have acted effectively. But undoubtedly the police allowed the Orange move to be organized at the outset and for several days military and police let the Orange mob have a fairly free hand. Who was pulling the

wires? The *Times* last autumn said that unhappily there seemed to be in the Unionist ranks in Ireland men who wanted to have an Irish rising in order to suppress it with terrorism. Have these men been in control at Derry?

On July 20, Tuam was brutally attacked by the police. The Irish correspondent of the New York *World* writes as follows of this incident:

Fully armed they [the police] marched into the streets, smashed public houses, and it is alleged looted them, dragged young men out of bed, threatened to shoot them and then set fire to some of the most valuable properties in the township. They retired to their quarters only after an orgy of destruction. The damage is estimated at \$500,000.

As I entered the town this morning it recalled nothing so much as some of the ruined Belgian and French towns and bore a striking resemblance to wrecked Albert. "Mind you are not shot, the police barracks are up there!" shouted a volunteer in derision to the sullen crowds that walked down Vicer street. Tension had reached a dangerous level and business was suspended. Hastily constructed wooden shutters marked the wreck of plate glass that lay strewn about the streets, and gray smoke still went up from the ruins of the Town Hall and a big drapery house.

In view of Britain's clamorous condemnation of German atrocities, it is interesting to note that General Macready publicly condoned the barbarous conduct of the police. On July 20, too, riots broke out anew in Belfast. It is significant that such anti-Irish papers as the New York *Times*, *Post* and *World* admitted that they were occasioned by Unionist attacks on Sinn Fein workers at the Queen's Island shipyard. Catholic chapels and rectories have been attacked, in one case at least, with fatal effect to a member of a religious community. In Belfast, for instance, St. Matthew's Church, rectory and convent were centers of attack and at Kilmallock a Catholic club and rectory were destroyed by police, who began the riot and fired volleys into several parts of the town, while the citizens were trying to extinguish the fires which were destroying their houses.

On July 22, Dr. Macrory, Bishop of Down and Connor, sent this significant wire to the Chief Secretary of Ireland:

The condition in Belfast is appalling this morning. Our Catholic people are being brutally driven from their homes. Unless the men expelled from Queen's Island be reinstated and adequately protected there is no hope of peace, and the ruffians who expelled them will only be encouraged to adopt similar tactics in the future.

Of course Carson is adding fuel to the flame. He sent out a call to the Ulster Volunteers to report to their respective battalions in order to be ready for action, and, moreover, he demanded an exterminatory campaign against his opponents. On the other hand, Arno Dosch-Fleurot wired the New York *World*, under date of July 23, that Sinn Fein was trying to avoid a continuance of the riots and that "the Catholic population is peaceful but nervous." Irishmen declare that Lloyd George is intent on breaking up the present movement, but out of fear of Carson does not dare take the step that he considers a means to that end, liberal Dominion home rule

Poland.—An Associated Press dispatch dated Warsaw, July 21, reported that the Bolsheviks had launched a general offensive from the Rumanian border to the

The Bolshevik Advance Pripyet Marshes, and had forced the River Zbrucz, bringing the battle to Polish soil for the first time. The

Reds also crossed the Styr River at one place. In the north they drove southward toward the River Niemen line, and took the town of Grodno. On July 22, owing to the defeat of the Polish army's left wing by the Bolsheviks the menace to Warsaw, the capital, was considered serious. In three weeks the Poles retreated for more than 180 miles. The Bolshevik drive has gone beyond the Polish boundary set by the Council of Ambassadors. A later but undated dispatch sent out by the Bolsheviks read:

In the direction of Bielostok we forced the Niemen River and are continuing to advance. In the direction of Kobryns (northeast of Brest-Litovsk) we occupied the town of Ruseany. In the direction of Kovel we captured a Polish divisional staff and a quantity of material.

On July 21 the Soviet Government's answer to England's peace proposals was received in London by wireless from Moscow. The dispatch, which was signed by

Soviet Answers England Premier Lenin, Minister of War Trotzky, and two others, ran:

The British Government addressed a proposal to us July 11 to cease war against Poland and begin peace negotiations with Poland and other border States, promising that the Polish troops, in case of an armistice being concluded, would retreat to a frontier marked last year by the Peace Conference.

In the same note it was proposed that General Wrangel and his Crimean shelter should not be touched. To all this we, the Council of People's Commissaries, answered by refusal.

If England had not desired war she would have stopped supplying Poland with munitions and money. England is carrying on negotiations with us as a concession to her working masses. Lord Curzon (the British Foreign Secretary) places it upon the League of Nations, in whose name he is making the proposal, but Poland enters into the composition of this league—Poland, who commenced a robber war against us.

All the members of the League, especially France, England and America are bound hand in hand in this provocative war of Poland against Russia and the Ukraine.

Our refusal of hostile mediation does not mean that we have altered our policy towards Poland. Moscow more than once has proposed peace to Warsaw, and if she will now appeal to us directly peaceful relations will be established between Russia and Poland sooner, better and more substantially in this way.

The communication says the real frontiers which the Soviet Government will establish with representatives of the Polish people will be east of the frontier marked out "by the Imperialists in London and Paris," who "are equally inimical and hostile to the workers of Poland and Russia."

If the Polish people," the communication declares, "desires to receive an honest peace and an honest frontier and find in the person of Russia a brotherly neighbor, it is necessary that the Polish people itself should seek it."

At a Cabinet meeting held in London July 20 to consider the Bolshevik's reply to England's peace proposals

it was decided to request the Polish Government to apply at once for an armistice with the Bolsheviks.

Addressing the House of Commons July 21 on the Polish crisis, the Prime Minister said that Great Britain and France would arm and equip the 300,000 volunteers

Lloyd George's Speech recently raised in Poland. He said that an independent Poland was essential to the whole fabric of peace, for if the Bolsheviks overran Poland that would be a great temptation to Germany to join them. "There was no reason that because Poland had made a mistake she should be destroyed."

M. Jusserand, French Ambassador to Washington, is heading the mission to Poland, the second member is General Weygand, representing Marshal Foch, and the third is M. Vignon, of the French Foreign Office. Lord A. d'Abenon, British Ambassador at Berlin, has gone to Warsaw as head of the English mission, Sir Maurice Hankey and General Radcliff being his associates. The mission's purpose is both diplomatic and military: to secure favorable terms for Poland or to direct the distribution of officers and munitions the Allies plan to send the Poles. But the Soviet Government does not seem to favor the participation of allied diplomats in the peace negotiations, preferring to deal with Poland directly and making recognition of the Soviet Government an indispensable condition.

On July 22 General Rozwadowski, Chief of the Polish General Staff, sent a wireless to the Soviet Government proposing the "immediate cessation of hostilities on the

Poland Proposes Armitice whole of the front and the dispatch of military delegates to arrange an armistice." Forthwith a new Coalition Cabinet was formed at Warsaw under the Premiership of M. Witos. The new Cabinet is said to have the support of the Socialist party, M. Paszynski, the head of the Socialist organization, being made Vice-Premier. The direct negotiations with the Soviet Government proposed an armistice along the entire 750-mile front. On July 24 a wireless from Moscow addressed to Prince Sapieha, the Polish Foreign Minister, and signed by George Tchitcherin, Soviet Foreign Minister, announced that the Poles' request for an armistice had been granted. The dispatch read:

The Russian Soviet Government has given orders to the supreme command of the Red army to commence immediately with the Polish military command negotiations for the purpose of concluding an armistice and preparing for future peace between the two countries. The Russian command will advise the Polish command as to the place and date for commencing negotiations between the military commands of the two sides.

Following this, on July 26, the Soviet offered peace to all the Allies laying down as a condition of the parley that the anti-Bolshevist, General Wrangel, should surrender immediately.

Daniel Mannix, Apostle of Liberty

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

THE time was Sunday, July 18; the occasion, New York's reception to the Most Rev. Daniel Mannix, Archbishop of Melbourne; the place, Madison Square Garden. Madison Square is not commonly accounted a shrine of pilgrimage, but it was on that hot and oppressive night when New York greeted three champions of liberty, his Grace, the Archbishop of New York, the Archbishop of Melbourne, and the Honorable Eamonn de Valera, President of the Irish Republic. For "we are here tonight," said the Archbishop of New York, "for a high and holy purpose. We are here to help make the world safe for democracy. We are here to express, as perhaps no other nation on earth can express, a reverence to the God of nations whose eternal justice cannot long be mocked or hindered."

That was the spirit of what was probably the greatest and most impressive public meeting New York has ever witnessed. Within the Garden 15,000 Americans were gathered; without almost as many more strove to gain admission. They were enthusiastic, they were vociferous, they raised their voices to sing the praises of Ireland, and to manifest their respect for their honored guest. But back of the shouting and the tumult was a love for liberty, which many in that crowd had brought from Ireland to be fanned into a consuming flame on an American altar of liberty. Let the propagandists make no mistake: it was no "foreign" gathering at Madison Square, but an assemblage of men and women, Americans in reality as well as in name, and they gave the great Australian apostle of liberty a greeting such as no prince or potentate has ever received, or with the exception of Albert of Belgium, could in any sense have deserved. In all that vast crowd, there was not a single hypocrite, passing over the presence, here and there, of a paid British propagandist; not a man who counted it a virtue to shout his love of liberty for small nations, while striving to tear liberty from the grasp, now firm, thank God, of the Irish people. They knew that they had gathered to bear an American witness to a high and holy cause; to help to make the world safe for democracy and free from hypocrisy, and their presence was a prayer that the God of nations, whose eternal justice cannot be mocked, might look with favor upon the supplications that rise from every liberty-loving heart in holy Ireland and throughout the world. "We are here," said Dr. Mannix:

Not because we are the enemies of any people or the enemies of any nation. We are not here by reason of any hatred we bear the English people. No; we are here not from hate, but from love of Ireland, because we love freedom and we hate oppression.

So the great Mercier might have spoken in the days when the rule of the foreigner oppressed his country.

We are here because we are not hypocrites who say one thing

and mean another. We are here because you and I believe in the principles so nobly enunciated by the President of the United States, because we sincerely hold those principles, and are consistent. We have no favorites among the tyrants of the world and, as a consequence, we want to apply President Wilson's principles to England and Ireland as well as to Germany and Belgium.

If consistency be a virtue, Archbishop Mannix is a saint, for during the whole of his public career, he has fought unflinchingly for the cause of liberty. His name at once recalls that other great champion of freedom, Cardinal Mercier, and the comparison shows him the peer of the famous Belgian primate. The Cardinal asserted the rights of his people, undaunted by the mailed fist of the German invader, and, outside the realm of the Kaiser, the world applauded. The Archbishop of Melbourne fought in the same cause, but without the tremendous aid of the sympathy so rightly and liberally accorded the Cardinal of Malines. In the defense of his people, and for Ireland, at a moment when his action was most open to misunderstanding and malicious misrepresentation, he dared proclaim against the power of Great Britain the principle that governments founded among men "derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Because he did this thing, he has been subjected to the hounding of the paid propagandist, and to the persistent calumny of the hireling press; but likewise, because he spoke for the rights of the people when, in the name of liberty, those rights were trampled under foot, he is forever enshrined in the hearts of all men who hold that tyranny is made a thousand times more infamous and loathsome when joined with hypocrisy. Mercier's crown is the praise of all who love freedom. The crown of the Archbishop of Melbourne is that, and the undying hatred of governments and men who glory in the oppression of the weak.

How any American can fail to follow the Archbishop of Melbourne, or refuse to grant the justice of the cause for which he pleads, must remain a mystery. As I write these lines, an immortal document, the Declaration of Independence, lies open before me. Happy in my generation, I was trained not only to revere, but to believe it. Hence I have never been able to refuse my assent to the assertion that men have "certain inalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," and further

That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. These principles were true in 1776. They are true for us today. They are true when applied to Belgium. They are no less true applied to Ireland. For more than seven centuries Ireland has asserted her independence. For more than seven centuries, she has lived under a tyranny of flame and blood that sought to make her people a sub-

ject people, to set at naught her laws and her customs, to destroy her language, to make her a thing of loathing and of scorn among the English people, and before the world; that, in these later centuries, has sought to turn son against father and daughter against mother, that has forbidden the education of the people of Ireland, and has striven to tear from the heart of the Irish child that last and most precious refuge and gift of God, the Catholic Faith. If this be not tyranny, and tyranny at which the heart grows sick, against which every upright man must revolt, there is no such thing as tyranny, liberty is a mockery, and our own form of government the rankest of hypocrisies. And I read further:

But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security. —— Such has been the patient sufferance of . . .

Of Ireland, let me insert.

The history of the . . . King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States.

And over Ireland. For us the Declaration of Independence presented a true case in 1776. Every American who knows the history of his own country, and something of the history of Ireland, knows that it presents a case at least equally true for Ireland in 1920. Against this case, Great Britain has one argument and only one; the argument which the civilized world has agreed to exclude from court: the argument that might alone is right. To quote the Archbishop of Melbourne:

They say that Ireland could be free, if it were only a thousand miles away. That is what is called the strategic reason. The meaning of it is that Ireland is so near that they require it in order to protect their own coasts, and that because they require it, they are going to hold it, whether they have a right to it or not. I can understand that argument; it is a splendid British argument. In fact, it is a good downright British argument, and the only argument they have. But what does it come to? It comes to the naked fact that might is right when the might is in British bayonets, and the right is in Ireland, or in Ireland's cause. Then might is right, and as long as they are able, they will hold Ireland, even though they have no right whatever to it.

But if the proximity to England gives them the right to hold Ireland, there is as much right, in fact, a greater right, to hold France, because France is nearer to them than Ireland. If they were able to hold France, they would be glad to do so. As a matter of fact, they did take France and they did hold France as long as they could, and they gave it up only when they could no longer hold it. They took Ireland also, and they held it, and they will hold it as long as they are able. But they will give it up only when they cannot hold it, and that will be very soon.

In the utterances of the two Archbishops and of the President of the Irish Republic, there was not one note of bitterness, much less of hatred, toward the English people. But these three champions of liberty are of Irish birth or ancestry; I, a person of no particular consequence, have no Celtic, but only—if you go back far enough—English blood-ties. Therefore I think I may fittingly express what they perhaps would not recall, adapting to the occasion the solemn words of our greatest American:

The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom offense cometh." If we shall suppose that the enslaving of the Irish race is one of those offenses which, in the Providence of God, must needs come, but which having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He lays across the offending people a terrible scourge, shall we discern any departure from those Divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray, that this mighty scourge may not be laid upon them. Yet if God wills that it fall and that it continue until all the wealth piled up by the 750 years of Ireland's unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none; with charity to all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in . . .

And that work is the full recognition throughout the world of the independence and sovereignty of the Republic of Ireland. For, as the Archbishop of New York well said, "The Irish problem is a world problem, and it needs a world solution." So long as without protest the governments of the world allow a powerful army and navy, backed by all the brute force of England, to mass against a people who for more than seven centuries have fought and died for the principles upon which all free government must rest, the cause of liberty cannot be safe. Ireland's cause is the cause of every nation dedicated to freedom. Ireland's cause, so eloquently interpreted by Australian's great champion of freedom, is pre-eminently the cause of every American who does not believe that the Declaration of Independence is a lie. The present British Government, whether acceptable to the English people or abhorred by them, loves liberty always; but only when liberty means subjection to England. That Government is and has always been the apostle of slavery in Ireland, and wherever there are small nations and weak peoples to be taught the blessings of English liberty at the mouth of a Sepoy cannon or the bloody point of a murderous bayonet. That Government's dominant philosophy is and has ever been, as the days of 1776 should have taught us beyond all forgetting, that might alone makes right.

As freedom dawns on Ireland, for as surely as God lives, British supremacy in Ireland has passed forever, may the God of our fathers keep us, the American people, far from any craven spirit of subservience to the greatest menace to human liberty that the world has ever seen. Fighting for liberty, we associated ourselves with the allied nations of Europe, and we shirked no burden, but fulfilled nobly through the blood of our people, the last of the obligations which we assumed. With French and English and Irish and Belgians we fought shoulder to shoulder, that tyranny might no longer oppress even the weakest of peoples. Ireland now fights alone, but not for herself alone. She is fighting for freedom for all peoples, fighting as the Allies fought, or

so we were told, for the rights of the people against the crowned tyranny of monarchs. Therefore is her cause not hers alone, but in the deepest sense, the cause of that great Republic whose first charter is the Declaration of Independence.

Therefore, too, the meeting at Madison Square Garden was not an Irish meeting. Called to do honor to the world's great apostle of liberty, Daniel Mannix, the Archbishop of Melbourne, it was first and foremost an assemblage of loyal Americans. We who gathered in Madison Square were drawn from many peoples, but because we are Americans all, we believe that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Therefore, will all true and alert Americans declare that Ireland "is and of right ought to be" a free and independent nation, "absolved," as by the blood of our forefathers we now happily are, "from all allegiance to the British crown."

Holland's New School Law

J. VAN DER HEYDEN

In a paper published in AMERICA Dec. 6, 1919, I called attention to an educational bill introduced into the Dutch Chambers by the Minister of Sciences and Arts, Dr. De Visser. The chief aim of the bill was to confer upon private primary schools, the three first grades of the secondary schools and upon all institutes preparing teachers for these classes of schools the same rights to support from the public treasury as were heretofore solely enjoyed by the State schools.

The bill, favorably reported upon in committee, was expected to be enacted into law before the close of the year. Alas! its framers reckoned without their host. First, national and international complications delayed the discussion, and then, Socialists and Progressives fought it article by article—and there were no fewer than 208 articles—proposed amendments and sub-amendments without number, in a word used every form of obstruction to harass the Minister and his associates in the debate. But with splendid endurance and self-reliance, with true statesmanship, with a thorough grasp of even the minutest details of the subjects under discussion, with a striking power of repartee and a calmness and patience that called forth the admiration of even the opponents, Dr. De Visser, ably seconded by Catholics and the members of the Christian Historical party, stood his ground week after week, to rejoice in success, full and complete, upon Wednesday, June 30, when the bill came up for its last reading, and for the final vote, which resulted in seventy-five yeas and three nays.

The day, June 30, 1920, is sure to remain a historic one for the Catholic people in Holland; for with it ended a struggle that lasted fifty-two years, a struggle in which tenacity of purpose, firm convictions, and prayer won at last. Yes, prayer: all the Catholic leaders in press and parliament who comment upon the glorious ending, the

triumph over the opponents of justice to all and favors to none, take pains to attribute it quite as much to the unabated prayers of parents, children, priests and religious during the long years of a most unequal fight as to the untiring labors of the rank and file of the Christian voters and of the noble chieftains into whose hands they placed the defense of their interests.

The chief whose brow today is wreathed with the laurels of victory and who, as soon as the votes were cast, received the congratulations of all his colleagues of the Chambers, Liberals and Socialists making no exception, paid a high and touching tribute of thanks and praise to all the champions, living and dead, of the cause of "pacification," as he called it, the cause of equality before the law—to the late priest-deputy, Dr. Schaeppman, to the Domine-premier, Dr. Kuyper, to the octogenarian parliamentarian, Dr. de Savorin Lohman, who, from the outset, fifty-two years ago, to the final chapter, five days ago, remained ever in the thick of the fight, true to his exalted ideas of justice.

In the general hand-shaking with the victorious minister following upon the vote, it was remarked that Dr. Lohman's shake lasted the longest. Both men looked into each other's eyes in silence, a silence a thousand times more eloquent than speech; a silence, a gaze and a hand-shake that provoked onlookers to thundering applause. The old man then smiled, and smiling received the congratulations showered upon him in turn. He had not been forgotten by outsiders either; for great baskets filled with flowers were brought for him by enthusiastic admirers to one of the anterooms of parliament.

I said that the fight began fifty-two years ago; even so, in the year 1868, with the bugle-call to action from the Catholic Bishops. That call is referred to in an article of the "*Maasbode*" headed "*Deo Gratias*" and signed by the Baron-deputy Van Wynbergen, another standard-bearer of Christian education for the children of his native land. It appeared in a joint pastoral on the school question and ended with the words:

That is what your Bishops feel that they are duty-bound to bid you take to heart. May their words, which have ever been those of Him in whose Name they speak, more so now than ever in this exceptionally weighty concern, make deep and lasting impression upon you! May your good, your truly Catholic dispositions, which you have at all times so clearly manifested and which have been a constant source of consolation to us in the discharge of the duties of our office, shine forth conspicuously in this vital matter of Catholic education! We do not for a moment doubt that you will support every move your reverend clergy will make along the lines of the principles laid down in this pastoral, everything they will undertake in the parishes of our dioceses for the erection, maintenance and improvement of Catholic schools, as well as what we ourselves, in the fulfillment of our pastoral charge, will still judge necessary to be done.

Neither will you cease to unite your most fervent prayers with ours, to obtain that the Lord vouchsafe to bless our efforts for the betterment of our schools and the securing for your children of a training in keeping with the spirit and the prescriptions of

their Holy Faith. Persevering in that prayer, we may well hope that the good God, who has visibly protected and assisted His Church in the Netherlands, will in due time bring about a favorable solution of this transcending issue of the education of our future generations. May it be thus.

It is thus at last, after fifty years of prayer, of work and of sacrifices. During these years there were times when everything seemed to work together to make the Catholic people lose heart; but they never for an instant did lose heart, because they were convinced of the righteousness of their claims and of the inborn fairness of the great masses of their fellow-citizens. They, therefore, prayed on, worked on, and submissive to the law, gave of their substance to pay for the schooling of the children of others, whilst they bore alone the full burden of paying for the schooling of their own. After a long, very long time, they obtained a first hearing and then, inch by inch, they won ground upon liberal exclusiveness and anti-clerical greed and ambition; one by one, they pulled out the stakes of the palisade that despotism had raised around freedom, and broke link after link of the shackles that chained liberty. They entered the citadel in 1889, when, by the Mackay law, the first support out of the State treasury was bestowed upon the denominational schools. That support was increased by the Borgesius law in 1901; and again, in these times to a notable extent, under the Dr. Kuyper ministry in 1905 and the Heemskerk administration in 1912.

However, even after 1912, the State schools still retained a big advance, because the communes remained legally empowered to subsidize them, to the exclusion of the private institutions. Thus in the Hague each primary-school pupil cost the city over and above the grants made by the State, nine dollars a year, in Amsterdam eight, and in Rotterdam seven. These communal favors which formed the last barrier to complete equality have been eliminated by the De Visser law. By the terms of that law no handicap of whatever sort exists any more for the private schools. They must be built and maintained out of the public funds just as the State schools are. Their teachers, inspectors, employees, are to receive the same salaries as their colleagues of the Government institutions and when disabled by sickness or old age all are to be pensioned on equal terms, whether they served the Commonwealth in a State school or a denominational school.

In their scrupulosity to be entirely fair, the framers of the bill went so far as to allow an annual interest of six and one-half per cent. on the cost price for the future use of all existing private elementary and normal school buildings and of those in course of construction or contracted for at the time of the passage of the bill. That item alone means an annual expenditure for the State of \$5,200,000; for the gross estimated value of all these buildings is reckoned to be \$80,000,000. They are not, all, as may be supposed, the property of Catholic parishes or institutions. Many are owned by Protestant organizations; for in Holland, among the members of the

Dutch Reformed Church, are to be found as staunch defenders of the denominational schools as among Catholics; and I know that in some parts of Zealand, Protestant private schools established in communities where Protestants are in the minority are used as a powerful means of propaganda against the Catholic Church.

Truly, Hollanders may be hailed as trail blazers for true liberty, for equality of all citizens of the land before the law, the rights of parents to have their children educated according to the dictates of their conscience. They may flatter themselves on having a Government that does what no other Government as yet did, what the only true Catholic Government upon earth, as the Belgian Government was called from 1884-1914, never as much as dared attempt during those thirty years of uninterrupted power, not even when its majority was two to one in Chambers and Senate.

Freed from the heavy burden of caring for elementary education, Holland Catholics will no doubt soon see their Catholic university dream fulfilled. Already large sums have been pledged for the purpose and only a few days ago the Bishops cut short long and animated discussions in the press about the eventual location of the institution by offering the plum to Nymegen, the most centrally located city for the bulk of the Catholic population. Well may we wish our Catholic Dutch brethren God-speed in this new and grand undertaking and, verily, they deserve the best we can wish them.

The British War Exhibition

A. HILLIARD ATTERIDGE

NOT long since King George V inaugurated the "Imperial War Museum," installed in the Crystal Palace on Sydenham Hill, London. What happened there I know only from the official program. The choir sang "God Save the King" and the hymn, "O God, Our Help in Ages Past," after which the Anglican Bishop of Southwark offered a prayer in which those who fell in the war were commemorated. "Commemorated," not "prayed for"—that would be "Romanist." Then the Archbishop of Canterbury "offered a prayer of thanksgiving for the restoration of peace," though peace is not quite restored as yet. It was only the other day that the Chief of the British General Staff, Sir H. Wilson, stated that there were now some twenty wars in progress.

This opening of the War Museum suggests some historical memories that show how far we have traveled from the pleasant illusions of some seventy years ago. I have been looking up the story of 1851. On the May Day of that year there was another royal ceremony under these same spans of iron, steel and glass that housed the War Exhibition. They then stood, not on Sydenham Hill, but in the midst of West London, in Hyde Park. Queen Victoria was inaugurating a great international exhibition, a vast display of the art and industry of all civilized nations. It was essentially a peace exhibition, planned by

the Queen's husband, the idealist German Prince, Albert, Duke of Saxe Coburg-Gotha. It is not easy for us now to realize the hopeful enthusiasm of that May Day of 1851. We get some idea of it from the newspapers and the literature of the time. The Crystal Palace had been built to house the exhibition, built from the designs of Mr. Joseph Paxton, who began life as a working gardener and was then in charge of the Duke of Devonshire's gardens at Chatsworth. Paxton had erected at Chatsworth a great palm house, then the largest thing of the kind in the world. His exhibition building was a colossal enlargement of that structure. He was knighted on the opening day. The long roof of glass, rising high over the elms of Hyde Park and flooded with the summer sunshine, seemed to those who saw it that day a fairy palace. Around the Queen stood the ambassadors of all nations, for there was peace on earth. Down the long nave of the building hung the flags of all nations. It was noted as of happy augury that the United States had sent their contributions to the display on board of a warship, the United States frigate St. Lawrence, that had fought against Britain in 1812, and whose guns were removed to make room for this peaceful cargo. Orators and journalists spoke and wrote of the day as marking a new epoch in the world's progress. The age of peace was dawning. The nations would no longer contend with the sword, but meet in friendly rivalry in the fields of industry, commerce and art. Thackeray voiced the feeling of the time in his "May Day Ode," in which he pointed to the inventions of peace as England's best armaments:

Look yonder where the engines toil;
These England's arms of conquest are,
The trophies of her bloodless war;
Brave weapons these
Victorious over wave and soil,
With these she sails, she weaves, she tills,
Pierces the everlasting hills,
And spans the seas.

The dream of the new golden age of peace did not last long. In three years the cannons were roaring on the Danube, and then began the new era of frequent wars, ever growing armaments, and the perversion of every new discovery of science to increasing the horrors of war. Under the roofs of the Crystal Palace Queen Victoria's grandson, as he declares the new exhibition of 1920 open, looks out on a long array, not of the works of peaceful industry and art, but of the new devices for human slaughter. Giant cannon, deadly machine guns, stand in rows, each with its tale of battle attached as a label. There are the booming aeroplanes and their high explosive bombs. There are the gas masks and poison gas projectors once denounced as the weapons of "degrading barbarism," now recognized by all nations as part of the apparatus of "civilized warfare." There is a wonderful display of the inventions of the engineer and the men of science. Photography, telephony, wireless are all represented, but all shown in their cunning adaptations to the work of war.

But of one aspect of war there is, I believe, no sign. The exhibition is to show us its wonders and its glories. But why harrow a holiday by making public war's grim realities? The exhibition has been organized in the same cautious spirit that led to the excision from war films of ugly records of men blown to pieces by H. E. shells or crumpled up dead under the shrapnel shower; in the same spirit that removed from a war photo exhibition a snap shot of a trench full of dead and wounded. So war is shown as a clever, scientific pursuit, with enough captured trophies thrown in to tell of its "glories." It might be useful to supplement the exhibition with a department showing other aspects of the business.

I heard today, as it happens, the frank opinion of an insignificant unit in the great war—a mere private of the British royal artillery. Was he going to see the new show at Sydenham? "No," he said, "I have seen enough of war." Then he made a suggestion that had some rough common sense in it. "If I was running the show," he said, "the visitors would get in through a lot of trenches. In some of them there would be mud and water up to the knees. There would be a lot of lively rats running about. We could hardly put in corpses, but there might be a dead horse or two outside the parapet, a dead horse a week or so old, giving the true war atmosphere. Crippled men on crutches might be employed to show the visitors around. There might be life-sized models of the dressing station, and the operation room of a hospital." One can hardly expect these crude realistic ideas to be regarded favorably by the promoters of official war exhibitions. But there is something to be said for the gunner's suggestion.

I am afraid very few people take the trouble to think. Otherwise the exhibition as it stands would be forcible enough in its message. Here is the same building which in 1851 displayed the works of peace, converted by a great nation into a pageant of man-killing devices, a museum of the methods of scientific destruction and slaughter. It shows with what weapons and by what methods the war of 1914-1918 was waged. But it gives hints too of the weapons that were just too late, such as, for instance, the giant bombers that were to have blown Berlin to pieces, that were actually loaded up with their bombs when the armistice came. There are the tanks which were just becoming really effective in the last months of the war. An eminent British officer forecasts the use of tanks in the next war—tanks that will carry tons of liquid gas and set it loose to destroy "every living thing" in their zone of action. Another gallant officer suggests that perhaps "germ warfare," the scientific diffusion of pestilence, will be the next development. So as one sees these weapons of the late war one wonders what will be the horrors of the great war of 19??; the date is doubtful but some think the next war is not far off, especially as so many little wars are already in full blast. Clearly the world has traveled a long way since May Day, 1851, but after all, this is an "age of progress."

The Allies and Catholic Missions

A. J. MUENCH

TRAVELING recently with a Swiss doctor who, for four years of the war, had been with the military forces of the Entente in the Orient, I heard from him some very interesting experiences he had had with patients who were stricken with spotted fever. The conversation turned upon the clear manifestation of subconscious thoughts in the delirious dreams of the patients, and his theory was that invariably in such a condition of mind thought habits will crowd themselves to the fore with all the accumulated force with which they had been developed; the stronger the conscious, or even unconscious, development of a habit of thought, so much the more strikingly will it appear when the mind is fired with feverish heat. Among his patients in the third year of war, when military operations were in a very critical stage in the Orient, just about the time of the capture of Jerusalem by General Allenby, was an English officer, an Anglican army chaplain. For a number of days the chaplain had been completely unconscious, and when finally the stupor broke into a delirium, he called for the doctor and, upon his arrival, said to him, apparently quite rationally: "Doctor, I am overjoyed that we finally have peace, and, thank God, Doctor, thank God, the whole world is English." Unmistakably these words revealed an ardent English mind, and if the doctor was correct in his theory, there can hardly be any question what was the wish of the heart.

This incident I recalled when lately, from authoritative sources, I learned of the cool, deliberate policy on the part of England to obstruct the work of Catholic missions in its colonial possessions, with seemingly no other purpose than to have the missions also add their bit in helping to make the world English. Not only have the Allied Powers, notably the British Government, made impossible the work of German missionaries, which was second only to that of France in the mission lands, either by expelling them entirely from the mission fields or by putting them under such restrictions that their activities are as much as paralyzed, but they are even reaching out into the neutral lands by interfering with the religious of neutral States who wish to replace the banished missionaries. Quite recently arrangements had been completed by the Propagation of Faith to have one of the religious communities of Switzerland take over some of the vacant mission houses, but the difficulties which the British Government has thus far created blocked the way for quick action, so stringently demanded by the deplorable conditions in the mission fields. The feeling is growing among those who have inside information in these matters that sinister anti-Catholic influences are at work; late events are bringing sufficient proofs that Protestant missionaries

are being favored in obtaining leave to depart for the British territorial possessions, for their work of evangelization. Perhaps it is for the reason that England considers this "good business." Yet this policy of procrastination affecting the Catholic missionary cause is not without suspicion. It is absolutely unjustifiable that the British Government delayed for many months an answer to a communication from the Propagation of Faith, on the question of the missions. When finally the memorandum came, it was quite manifest what England understood by articles 122 and 438 of the Treaty of Versailles, regulating missionary property and persons in the former enemy colonial possessions. Nothing less than a nationalization of the missions is proposed. They are to serve national purposes and national political aspirations. They are to be an instrument for the maintenance and support of the Empire, and hence are considered of value only in as far as they effectively promote this end. Their spiritual purposes are entirely discounted. The rights of the Church are completely ignored. It is equivalent to a denial that the Church "is a society chartered as of right Divine, perfect in its nature and in its title, to possess in itself and by itself, through the will and loving kindness of its Founder, all needful provision for its maintenance and action," as Pope Leo XIII admonished the world in his Encyclical, "*Immortale Dei*," Nov. 1, 1885, on the Christian constitution of States. The political control which the British Government exercises over the missions is in direct contravention of these God-given rights of the Church. It is a spoliation that must call forth our vehement protests. In his memorial on the mission clauses of the Treaty, von Brockdorff-Rantzaу well characterized the nefarious intentions of these clauses when he wrote, May 17, 1919:

If we compare article 438 of the Treaty of Peace with the stipulations of the Congo act, which guarantee to Christian missions freedom and protection, we perceive with consternation how much worse the position of Christian missions in regard to their rights and privileges has become under the new treaty and how much our confidence in the action of the Allies has been shaken, as we find the provisions lowered to the level of national institutions. It means the reduction not only of the German but of all Christian missions to a state of subjection to politics, which is in direct opposition to their nature and to their methods of action.

The Church cannot, and will not, tolerate that her rights be dragged into politics, or that they be made subservient to nationalism, whatever its color or stripe. The Gospel of Christ is above all nationalism. Though almost 2,000 years have elapsed it is still the Gospel as preached by St. Paul, according to which there is neither gentile nor Jew, barbarian nor Scythian, slave nor freeman, but all, and in all things Christ.

We cannot accept the mission clauses of the Treaty of Versailles. It is quite beside the point that article 438 of the Treaty states that the property of missions within the territory formerly held by the Germans but now in the possession of the Allied or Associated Powers, shall continue to be devoted to missionary objects. We reject the implied assumption that it could or would be used for any other but missionary purposes. Missionary property is directly under the jurisdiction of the Church, which is plain from canon 1350, paragraph II, of the new Code, which reads: "In all other territories the entire care of missions among non-Catholics is reserved solely to the Holy See." Commenting on this the *Osservatore Romano* wrote, June, 1919:

It is easy to see how much the rights of the Apostolic See are infringed by articles 122 and 438 of the Treaty of Peace. One has only to keep in mind that all Catholic missions, both as regards their property and their staff, depend directly on the Holy See. (Canon 1350, par. II.) No priest, be he secular or religious, can go to the missions unless he be provided with a pass from the Propaganda, which exercises full control over all the missionaries. It may be added that, according to the Divine constitution of the Church, the Pope has the right to send out for the conversion of infidels apostles of all nations, Germans not excluded. If any nation were to be debarred from this apostolate, it would mean, in a certain sense, setting a barrier to Divine rights. Hence the Church resents the affront that her mission property would be used for any other but religious purposes and refuses to acknowledge the usurped domination of any Power either to divert it from this object or to dictate what this object shall be. The Church well knows her place. If the State were always to know it equally well, the world would not suffer in so large measure today from strife and oppression that, like a curse, hang over its life. "Render to Caesar, the things that are Caesar's, and to God, the things that are God's"—statesmen have forgotten to write this as a text over their principles of statecraft.

We also must protest most energetically against the further provision of article 438, that these properties are to be placed in charge of boards of management appointed by their respective Governments and composed of persons belonging to the Christian religion. This is a most outrageous provision. No business firm would tolerate such an unwarranted interference by any government or any association of governments; at no price would it allow the appointment of its board of management by no matter how wise or virtuous a State. The Church is more than a business enterprise; it is directly responsible to God. Therefore, the Church is not a subject of the State. She is a complete, independent society with her own sphere of jurisdiction. Much less, therefore, can the Church allow what no business corporation would allow. If there are to be any boards of management for Catholic missions, the Church is fully competent to create them herself; she does not need political gamesters to do that for her. This insidious spoliation of the right of the Church must stop. We Catholics are unworthy of our Faith if we do not use every legitimate means to rise in defense of the rights of the Church. Fearless, death-defying courage caused a Cardinal Mercier to do this

openly and publicly in defense of his nation; is it possible then that we, prelates, priests and laity, will do less in defense of the Church of Christ? Should our tongues be courageous only in defense of the rights of nations and cowardly in defense of the rights of the Church? Why then silence and inaction?

Now as to another point. The boards of management are to consist of persons belonging to the Christian religion. Note well, the terms of the article do not read that the board of management is to be composed of persons belonging to the religious Faith which has the right of disposal over these properties. It requires only that the persons belong to the Christian religion, a very wide term, which may mean anything with a statesman for whom also religion may mean anything. Calling himself a Christian, an enthusiast for the Interchurch World Movement might think it a capital idea to promote his designs to have Protestants on these boards of management controlling Catholic missionary property. Improbable, some will say. Perhaps, but not impossible, and we ask, why was article 438 not worded so as to preclude this possibility? We have reasons to feel suspicious. It is true that Mgr. Cerretti, the special envoy of the Holy Father at the Peace Conference, succeeded in obtaining the concessions that freedom of conscience and religion in the missions would be safeguarded, that the property of the Catholic missions would be recognized as belonging to the Holy See, and that the Boards of Trustees mentioned above would be composed of truly accredited members of the Catholic Church. But if these concessions were worth making, what hindered their insertion into the Treaty? Breach of word is quite common these days, and hence we feel more secure when we have a promise in black and white, particularly when there is question of treaties that are supposed to be open covenants openly arrived at. Indeed treaties, as we have come to learn, are worth little, but concessions still less. Just one year has passed since Balfour submitted the first memorandum of the British Government to the Holy See on the mission question, and in this time the British Government has been guilty of a four-fold breach of word, as was recently pointed out by Mgr. G. B. Tragella, professor on Catholic missions in Rome, in a splendid series of articles on the status and the future of Catholic missions written for the *Osservatore Romano* in the month of April, 1920. He supports his indictments with an abundance of facts.

The whole question resolves itself into this, whether or not the interests of the Church shall continue to be dominated by the interests of the State. It would appear that the British Government is determined that the State shall relentlessly keep on its course of nationalization. The second memorandum—England's belated answer—which came to the Vatican recently, does not leave this in doubt. Missionaries from former enemy nations are debarred from the mission fields for an indefinite period of time. Other missionaries, non-British subjects, whether they be French, Belgian, American, Spanish or Italian,

are required to file their papers asking leave to enter British colonial possessions with the superior of an affiliated Religious Order or Congregation whose jurisdiction is within the British Empire. This superior must be an Englishman. His duty is to institute an inquiry into the antecedents of the missionary filing his application. The Government reserves to itself the right to make further inquiries if it finds this advisable. Only Religious Orders and Congregations approved by the British Government may labor in the English mission fields; this approval may be withdrawn at any time. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster must give his recommendation before the Government puts the Religious Order or Congregation on the approved list; he must countersign the papers of identification of the missionary either himself or through some official empowered to act in his name. This clause, clause V of the memorandum, has caused great dissatisfaction in Rome. The Propagation of Faith, which alone is competent to deal with missionaries and which alone has jurisdiction over them, is completely ignored. In fact the whole proceeding is most humiliating for the Church. It constitutes a policy of spoliation of her rights which few governments have dared to make, and all in the name of that new deity of our times, nationalism. "Thank God, Doctor, thank God, the whole world is English," these delirious ravings also express quite well the ambitions of cool, deliberating statesmen with imperialistic designs. The world must be English, and to realize this end the missions must be pressed into service.

Our first duty is energetically to support the Holy Father in upholding the rights of the Church. Apostolic liberty and independence has not only been endangered, but has actually already been taken away. All of us, whether Americans, French, Germans, Italians, or English, must insist on the just claims of the Church. The Catholic Faith and its rights are above all nations. Nationalism in religion we must condemn. The Gospel of Christ is supernational. But we must act quickly; we must get into action now, now and not after the evil has been accomplished. We must do it with the courage and in the spirit of the gentleman at the Social Congress of Christian Workmen at Luzerne in March, 1919, who, pointing to the crucifix in the assembly hall, said in words that have burned themselves in to the soul of all who heard them:

In the name of the Crucified I conjure this Congress not to separate before turning its attention to the violation of the Congo act by the Entente and the expulsion of German missionaries from China, and before transmitting the protests of the meeting to the Paris Conference.

Thus spoke a Swiss in his strong, rugged, straightforward Swiss fashion; and thus all of us, forgetful of race, or nationality, must speak.

Voicing our protests in words, we must secondly seek to enforce our claims with deeds. We have a right to demand from political parties, favoring a ratification of the Treaty, even though with reservations, what their at-

titude is with reference to the mission clauses of the Treaty; and, if standing for reservations, what reservations they are going to make with respect to these same clauses. If missions are considered to be politically important enough to deserve special consideration in a treaty of peace, then we have a right to demand from politicians, who, as statesmen, are to represent our interests, that they safeguard these interests with justice to our convictions. Refusing to do this, they can have no claim on our support. They, not we, have made the missions political institutions of their respective nations. We deplore this and condemn it; but having done so they must stand by the consequences of their creation. They must come to a decision without equivocation, and we have a right to know what their decision is.

The K. of C. Supreme Convention

JOHN B. KENNEDY

THE thirty-eighth annual supreme convention of the Knights of Columbus to be held in New York on August 1, 2 and 3 will be the climax of a series of events that are of permanent importance in the post-war history of the United States, and of all other countries where the Knights operate as a corporate body: Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, Cuba, Panama, Porto Rico, the Philippines and Hawaii. Since their peace convention in Buffalo last year the Knights have done more than one good thing well, but the best of their many services to the common weal is their demonstration of the fact that while war hysteria may be unbecoming or obnoxious in times of peace, yet the kindness exercised during war, personal aid to men without the derogatory touch of patronage, can be applied effectively to the problems of peace. They have also done the country a further service by exemplifying an economy in the management of a large unconditionally subscribed fund so that they have been able to make the strange and refreshing announcement that there will be no national drive by or for the K. of C.

Last year the Knights were on the high tide of popularity. The returning ten thousands of the A. E. F. sang their praises. Our own Government and the Government of France and also the Holy See bestowed high honor upon the Order's chiefs in recognition of the Order's merits. The Knights were flushed with success; but with the mother wisdom that has characterized them throughout their public career, they did not mistake the flush of success for their mean temperament. They knew that this flush was the result of hard, intelligent and humanly plain work, and that if success were to be permanent and not suffer through reaction, this same quality of work must be continued. They continued it.

While aiding in every practicable way the demobilization processes of the service men, the Knights had their own demobilization to work out. Approximately 4,000 K. of C. camp workers had to be returned to their homes

with satisfactory tokens of their service during the war. This the Knights did speedily, smoothly, and while they were doing it they were called upon to expand to nationwide proportions the dual reconstruction work of employment and education that they had planned months before the signing of the armistice and launched with the return of the first men from overseas. They instituted a perfect system of welcoming homeward-bound transports on this side of the Atlantic, just as they carried on a completely efficient work of wishing a practical Godspeed to the troops on the other side. They maintained major entertainment projects until the last troops left France, and they opened up their work in far Siberia, in Hawaii and the Philippines and Alaska and Panama at a time when there was crying need of it. Then, when their immense activities in Europe had been well wound up, they responded to the request of an American admiral by opening clubs and schools in Venice, Spalato and Constantinople, and maintaining a club for American relatives of fallen heroes in Paris.

Meantime, the educational plan adopted by their Peace Convention was being put into effect. Their employment bureaus, gaining ground every day, were finding jobs, good paying jobs, at the rate of 7,000 a week, their work ramifying into the agricultural districts where help was most needed. The Knights were hardly started on their project of establishing free night schools for former service men in metropolitan centers when they conceived the idea of promoting the cause of higher education by sending veterans to college for full courses.

They were swamped with applications for the one hundred scholarships they offered, so that they increased the number to more than 400 to accommodate the men who qualified. The intricate detail of corresponding with each of these 3,000 men and supervising personal examinations and assigning and transporting scholarship winners to the institutions they had elected was a task demanding the most rigid cutting of red tape, at which the Knights have for long qualified as experts.

Gradually their first schools were established on the basis of a simple and practical curriculum. They eschewed the role of upifters and provided the definition for a new combination "onhelpers." They realized that happiness cannot be pursued comfortably or with any prospect of capture on an empty stomach. They were convinced that the young men, and the young women, who had sacrificed much for their country should, at least, receive the opportunity to obtain something back in the way of lost economic advantage, and without any delay beyond what was necessary to make a discreet and comprehensive look before leaping, they transformed the K. of C. hut of the camps and the trenches into the K. of C. school of the cities. Their seventy-three schools closed for the summer recess on June 30, after graduating 40,000 pupils, the vast majority ex-service men and women, but some civilians who paid nominal fees. Of course, nothing with the initials K. C. attached to it could ever imply a charge

against a service or ex-service man. The first national educational convention of the Knights of Columbus brought educators from all parts of the country to Chicago, where plans were laid for the expenditure of the \$7,000,000 balance of the K. of C. war fund on the expansion of the K. of C. school system during the summer so that next autumn more than 200,000 veterans and civilians may enjoy the opportunities offered in self-improvement. The Knights know that war echoes are diminishing and it is their aim to make their schools permanent assets to the communities in which they are located and their system a constant contributor to the economic and civic betterment of the nation.

As for Americanization, a large proportion of the men for whom the Knights found jobs and to whom they gave education were foreign-born. But to call this Americanizing is, bluntly, to be snobbish. It is impudent to proclaim that you are making an American out of a man who has shed his blood and been willing to lose his life for America. True, the open forums conducted by the Knights throughout the country with trained speakers like Peter W. Collins, James J. Walsh and David Goldstein are Americanization, for they are open challenges to those holding Socialist and generally destructive philosophy. These K. of C. lecturers have addressed 2,000,000 persons during the past year and hundreds of unreasonable radicals, chiefly young men, have been converted to the common sense and the healthy viewpoint that the best way to cure the ills of society is to improve one's own little niche in it, at the same time helping those who are not so expert in self-improvement.

The Knights truly consider their testimonial to France an integral part of their reconstruction work. In presenting a statue of Lafayette, with appropriate historic bas-reliefs, they are memorializing the men who defended liberty under Foch and Pershing on the sacred soil from which sprang the man they honor, just as they are perpetuating the memory of the joint struggle by France and America for liberty under Washington and Lafayette. The French nation has thrilled to the significance of this gift, coming spontaneously, unconditioned, a free will offering solely from the Knights. The gift, too, of a baton made of American precious metals and jewels, is, to France, a token of the friendship that has, at times, been obscured by the miasma of reaction from the war's heroics. This gift to the gray man of Christ, who will personally unveil the K. of C. statue at Metz on August 21, is one that goes with the unanimous good will of the American nation.

The Knights' pilgrimage to Europe ranks as a memorable rapprochement between France and the United States. Men from every State in the Union will be among the 250 making the tour, which will be an occasion for stimulating the international amity that cannot be overnourished. The climax of this tour, the visit to the Vatican as the guests of Pope Benedict, is characteristic of that sturdy faith and loyalty to spiritual authority

which, as the Knights have demonstrated even to the conviction of the darkly doubtful, is not only consistent with civic allegiance, but is its essential sustenance.

It has been a year of great events for the Knights, not the least of which have been such items as the publication of their momentous history, "Knights of Columbus in Peace and War," and their quiet raising of a substantial fund for Belgian reconstruction under the direction of their most esteemed member, Cardinal Mercier. They do not proclaim to the world that they come from Samaria; but the nation knows their active chivalry, and it knows, too, that their knighthood will flower as bravely and effectively during the coming year as it has in the past.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words

The High Cost of Dying

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The writer was told by a Protestant neighbor that his Catholic housekeeper, on returning from the funeral of her cousin, said: "Oh, he had the most beautiful funeral! There were sixty coaches!" And then he added: "As the charge for these coaches was eight dollars each, I suppose the Church must make something on it, or it would discourage such extravagance by a widow at a time when she needs money most for herself and orphan children."

It took some time to explain to my Protestant neighbor that though the undertaker's office was usually within the shadow of the church, the clergy, from the Pope down, had, through all ages, decried excessive display at funerals. It was human pride, "To be just as good as their neighbor," "Keeping up with the Jones's," that was responsible for this turning a Christian burial into a pageant.

These long funeral corteges, particularly among foreign-born Catholics have grown to the proportions of public scandals and the profiteering through it all should be better known so that Catholics themselves may turn against it, for there is a revolt just now against profiteering of every kind.

Here are a few of the writer's observations of the customary procedure at a funeral: The widow is naturally dazed and stunned on the death of her hard-worked husband. She is worn out by the long vigils at his bedside, when she sends for the undertaker. He is a mild-speaking, honest-looking individual, otherwise he would not be in the business. He expresses his great sympathy for her in her loss and will relieve her of any further trouble by attending to everything from the death notices in the newspapers to the care of the grave afterwards.

"Was your husband insured?" "That's good. I would like to take the policy. I will attend to getting the money for you. It is no trouble. I usually do it, as the widow has no time for such things." And then the profiteering begins.

First it is the newspapers: Death notices are news and should be published free. If ordinary advertising averages twenty cents a line the poor widow is charged sixty cents a line.

Now as to the casket. Coffins are not fashionable any more, and one must be in fashion, particularly in funerals. The undertaker produces a handsome album showing beautifully executed illustrations of caskets. He is careful to call attention to the costly ones neighbors have used for their late husbands. Of course the present widow's husband was the best man in the world so there is no casket too good for him. Will she have silver handles or a long silver bar handle?

The widow is not told that though the handles are exceedingly costly they are merely ornamental. The wood in the casket is of such poor quality that the handles would pull off if there was any attempt made to use them. The widow leaves it all to the experienced judgment of the sympathetic undertaker and the charge for the casket is at least \$150.

Then the room in which the body lies must be all draped in black. There must be a rosette of ribbons intermingled with flowers at the outer door. Elaborate candelabra and fresh boxes of candles, those of the latter not used are charged for. All of this helps to increase the widow's bill.

It is fashionable now to have "porters" instead of pall bearers to carry the casket into the church. The widow must have a separate coach for these porters, they could not possibly walk to the church no matter how near it was. She must also pay for new black gloves for these porters.

Then comes the cost of the coaches or automobiles. The undertaker suggests plenty of coaches, though the charge for them is exorbitant. Speaking to a conscientious old undertaker in New York about the coach scandal he said he had given up advising poor people against the extravagance of so many coaches for he found that when he attempted to discourage their use his people hired the coaches elsewhere.

The ferry companies, who transport the hearse across the Hudson River, join in the profiteering. The ferriage tariff for an automobile might be twenty-five cents but when it is an auto-hearse the ferriage costs the widow seventy-five cents. In New York the charge for an automobile from Manhattan, a distance equal to Calvary cemetery and back, might be six to ten dollars, but again the widows and orphans must suffer, for if it is a funeral the charge is from sixteen to twenty dollars. And so it goes. If the widow can pay all the bills connected with the death and burial of her husband with \$500 she is fortunate. She has left it all to the undertaker and she wants as good a funeral as her neighbors and a little better if possible, so the undertaker is not entirely blameworthy, if a good part of the insurance money is squandered.

It is needless to enumerate the scandals connected with embalming, the excessive charge for the garments for the dead, the great waste of money in floral emblems which usually require that the widow pay for an extra coach to carry them. One most gratifying feature about this is that the Church forbids these dying flowers being carried into the church. A single fervent prayer for God's mercy on the soul of the deceased is worth more to him than all the floral emblems that were ever bought.

One may say that undertakers show little evidences of wealth. This is due partly to the fact that the profits in the business are so great and the labor so light that too many are attracted to it as an easy means of livelihood. The result is those in it frequently enter into a gentlemen's agreement to keep up prices so they may all get a living out of it. Then the undertaker has a great many bad debts, he is also at the mercy of a "Casket Trust" which is the real profiteer, but the widow in the end must support them all.

The remedy for this growing evil is in the hands of Catholic people. They must stop trying to outdo each other in display at funerals. Don't leave it all to the undertaker. Have some trusted friend of the deceased get from the undertaker a list of necessary expenses with the charges for everything. Dispense with display. Return to the ways of our fathers, when friends of the dead walked to the church, in communities where this is possible. Above all other occasions this is one of prayer not of pomp.

This is work for Vincentians, Holy Name, Knights of Columbus and other societies to take up and carry through. Once make costly funerals unfashionable in your parish and you will have cured the evil. There is a fight on against

profiteering in every necessity of life. Let us take this opportunity to protect the poor, the widow and the orphan against those who would profiteer in death.

Orange, N. J.

STEPHEN H. HORGAN.

An Enthusiastic Brooklynite's Complaint

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Under the title "Carmelites Open Monastery in New York," the Baltimore *Catholic Review* of July 17 says:

For many years the Catholic population of New York City has desired and prayed for a Carmelite Monastery to be established in its midst. And, indeed, it is most expedient and fitting that in the great metropolis of the United States, that center of bustle and activity, there should be a few souls specially set apart for the direct service and praise of God, and who, by their unceasing prayer, should endeavor to draw down a continual stream of grace. God's time for this event has now arrived.

As a native Brooklynite reader of AMERICA since its inception I regret to find the July 24 issue of my favorite review giving an echo of this misleading announcement in the statement by A. L. T. that it will interest AMERICA's readers "to learn that the Carmelite nuns have succeeded in establishing a monastery in New York." New York has had a Carmel for a number of years, at 745 St. John's Place, Borough of Brooklyn. The Prioress of this, the first community of Discalced Carmelite nuns to settle within the boundaries of "the great metropolis of the United States," is Mother Teresa of Jesus, a daughter of that famous Catholic journalist, James A. McMaster, so long the editor of the old *Freeman's Journal*. Most people also refer to him as a "New York editor," but in fact he lived and died in Brooklyn.

No doubt A. L. T. is among those benighted individuals whose insularity leads them to imagine that the Empire City is pent up within the very restricted area of Manhattan island. In the proud consciousness of our fast growing millions (see recent census totals) we in Brooklyn look across the East River and realize that like Troy, Manhattan was.

Brooklyn.

M. F. T.

Religious Articles and Decoration

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I doubt, if at any period in the history of America there has been a time when the people at large have taken so great an interest in their homes and gardens, striving after individuality in decorating, naturalness in gardens and comfort in the art of living in pleasing and happy surroundings. Interior decoration has a tremendous vogue. There are hundreds of textbooks and magazines devoted both to gardening and to interior decoration as well as to architecture. The professionals of the crafts are reaping a harvest and seem bent on doing their best to satisfy the craving for the unusual and the bizarre, even at the expense of the art of true decoration. I have been a subscriber to several magazines dealing with such subjects, and I cannot help but notice the tendency to misuse of sacred articles in the home, "as touches of atmosphere," to complete a so-called Italian room, a Gothic room and so on.

I should say that good decorating is merely putting the right thing in the right place. Can you give a better definition? Would you consider it decorative or good decoration to hang a priest's vestments (say those used in Benediction), on the walls of an "Italian" room supposedly to supply the necessary atmosphere. This is quite the *dernier cri* as the decorators say. Is it good decoration to use old missal stands for book supports, altar cloths on library tables, prayer stalls, sanctuary lamps fitted up for electricity, etc., etc? If you can procure a copy of the June number of *House and Garden*, read the article by Peyton Boswell on "Gothic Statuary as Decorations." Do read this article through, especially where the writer speaks of introducing besides Gothic statues of the Saints, a prayer

hall and even a pulpit to carry out the illusion and provide a retreat for the owner that will be full of spiritual appeal. Imagine a pulpit in a home and consider this advocated by a magazine as an example of good decoration.

I wrote to the editor of *House and Garden* and took issue with him on the subject. He replied in a rather nice letter that he could see nothing offensive and that he felt assured that a Gothic room would appeal spiritually to any person, non-Catholic or even Jew. In my letter I said that this was absurd. He further stated that for that matter decorators used the Jewish candlestick with the sign of David as pure decorative touches, while statues of heathen gods, Buddhas, etc., are also used extensively. This is true, and good decoration suffers thereby. I also declared that these old articles of the Church, if they were genuine and not fakes, could not get into the hands of dealers unless at some time or other, they were stolen. The Church sells none of her goods. Would antique cruets, missal stands, altar cloths, laces, statues, pulpits, etc., be sold? The editor said that he could not believe this but reasoned that the Church in providing herself with new needs, sold and did away with the old. He said that wonderful, beautiful examples of Church art could be seen at any time in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, and that these goods were assuredly not stolen and their authenticity could not be questioned. I never could imagine the Church parting with her vestments, altar linens, etc., etc., etc.

I certainly do think that some publicity should be given to this ridiculous and offensive misuse of the articles of the Church. One last observation. As the good editor tells me he believes non-Catholics do find spiritual appeal in statues of the Saints done in the Gothic, evidently the millennium has arrived. The good people, fired by the decorative touch, have at last arrived at the truth that the wicked Roman Catholic really does not fall down and grovel at the feet of many gods.

Philadelphia.

ARTHUR J. DONNELLY.

Is the Newspaper the Mirror of Life?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the issue of AMERICA for July 10, Leo Hillman has a very unique view of the press. He is undoubtedly right in maintaining that the newspaper is the mirror of life. But I do not see that his contention that "before the sage can make the newspapers clean he must make the people clean," is warranted. The paper as an organ of thought and opinion outthinks or prethinks the people. The best brains of the country to a great extent will be found in newspaper offices. The vast majority of people do as little thinking as possible, but they read the papers. They find ideas there in nearly every case well-thought out, even if they are wrong ideas. If you wait for the people to form their own ideas, to judge, criticize or discriminate you will wait a long while.

The press, if it held to its function of a university of the people, adhered strictly to truth, gave the facts in cases where only facts matter, would be a tremendous educational weapon. In many cases it panders to the crude, the sensational or even to the positively immoral. It is in a position to lead and it is satisfied to follow, or to lead awrong. It will feature the sensational or play up the crude side of a story, even painting crime in high places or in so-called artistic settings as if it were virtue. Unless it is an elevating influence it cannot be educational and if it is not educational it has little reason for reaching out "with the greatest things of interest to the greatest number."

Certainly if the majority of readers were high-principled the circulation of many papers would fall. Are we to wait till the readers are pure before endeavoring to purify the press? Why not help them become pure in principle and thought by working for a press that is straight and clean, honest and truthful?

Chicago.

HAROLD HALL.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, JULY 31, 1920

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1108, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSlein; Treasurer, CHARLES J. DEANE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Mr. Bryan and the Vatican

THE former Secretary of State and the past, present, future, imperfect, pluperfect candidate for the presidency of the United States, one William Jennings Bryan of the Chautauqua Circuit and Nebraska, is, in the words of Artemus Ward, "an amusin' little cuss" who can turn any trick or phrase for thirty cents, half a dollar or a dollar, according to the religion or disposition of his audience. Recently he went through his tricks in Salt Lake City, before an admiring throng from which he caught the inspiration that usually seals the fate of cross-eyed prophets, those Homeric creatures that creep on all fours amongst upstanding heroes. And forthwith, like Balaam's famous charger, William opened his mouth and spoke, not after the manner of the ass, however; at least if the Salt Lake *Tribune* for June 28, 1920 can be believed. For, declared Mr. Bryan,

But the "lights are out in the capitol," so to speak; the advocates of wine and beer have come up against a stone wall. They have counted noses, regardless of color, and they find that they cannot hope to poll a majority, probably not a third in favor of any wet plank, no matter how ambiguous its terms might be. Nothing having the odor of the Vatican can hope to receive the approval of the convention.

And there the prophetic inspiration failed. Or was it that for an instant the light of worldly wisdom flashed on the Commoner's mind? For it is noticeable that he omitted to insult the Christ of Cana and the Cenacle. Perhaps that grossness is reserved for a further occasion, for another thirty cents or half a dollar. Be that as it may, the Catholic Prohibitionists are to be congratulated on their leader, their professor of ethics, the Father Confessor of their souls, but, on the other hand, the politicians would do well to put the exquisitely tactful and courteous Commoner on the circuit with a yodler or two, a trained dog, and, by all means, a goat and a monkey. The votes will fairly roll in. They did so once before under the spell of "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion."

Free the Debtor Too

IF so sacred a contract as that of marriage can be canceled by the power of the State, why should not our legislators easily grant us a like freedom from other less serious obligations? Apropos of the British Parliament's recent Divorce bill which confers on King George's loyal and loving subjects the right to be bigamists, the editor of the India *Catholic Herald* makes a moving appeal to the same Parliament for the passage of similar legislation that will free all Englishmen from "another sort of superstitious tyranny under which we have been groaning for centuries, the iniquitous law of debts." Using effectively the arguments with which the favorers of the Divorce bill urge that measure, the writer continues:

The sufferings that have been inflicted on humanity by that old-fashioned Christian idea that a man must pay his debts are incalculable. Think of the young lives it has blighted, the despair, the anxiety often ending in suicide, the shame it has brought on innocent families. In justice to an enlightened age, and to the millions suffering for nothing but the superstition of our forefathers, we want an act similar to the divorce act, empowering any of the two parties, the debtor for instance, to cancel his debts whenever the yoke becomes a nuisance.

It has been pointed out in defense of divorce that many unions are contracted as a result of the parties' ignorance concerning the nature and meaning of marriage. Why should they be made to suffer for no fault of their own? Identical ignorance is playing havoc with our generation in the matter of debts. According to the best authorities in shop-keeping, eighty per cent of the ladies who buy luxuries have been brought up in perfect ignorance of the nature of a debt. (Husbands would put the average at ninety-nine per cent.) They do not know what they bind themselves to. How can the law support such a tyranny founded on such ignorance?

As was stated in Parliament, it is foolish to think that facilities for divorce will strike at the root of the family, and break up the home. Similarly shall we find fools to assert that facilities for canceling debts will strike at the root of trade and break up every shop. Like the upholders of divorce, we believe in the fundamental goodness of mankind. Let those who look upon debts as an intolerable nuisance, be freed from all anxiety and entitled to contract other debts instead; and enough people will always be found sufficiently honest to make trade a profitable avocation. Besides, why should I be robbed of my peace of mind and of my liberty, because in a moment of distraction I bought a necklace, which I shall never be able to pay for? Besides, I have given it away. This is an age of individualism. No man should be made to suffer for the benefit of society.

It has also been said that an arbitrary refusal of the remedy of divorce is as immoral as the laxest system of divorce could be. Divorce will counteract the immorality due to the intolerant strictness of the marriage tie. Just so. And that is precisely the reason why we advocate the right of canceling our own debts. Thousands of men are so made that they cannot honor their bills. It is their temperament. They are therefore forced by law to live in a state of immorality, which is a scandal to the public, a cause of ceaseless worry to themselves and their creditors. Let us have an act giving us in the matter of debts a similar freedom as in the matter of marriage. It will at once stop all injustice, all worry, and restore peace to millions of sufferers.

The foregoing arguments for the right of individuals to cancel inconvenient debts really seem quite as plausible and convincing as are those employed by the proponents

of easier divorce laws. If any such legislation as that described above were seriously favored in Great Britain, in the United States or in other civilized nations of today, it is not hard to see what short work the plain common-sense of the people would make of both the measure and its sponsors. Is it at all surprising then that the Catholic Church, to whom God has committed the defense and protection of the marriage bond, should consistently deny that the State has any right whatsoever to pass divorce laws which legalize bigamy? For the Church which was founded by Christ and whose visible head is St. Peter's successor, has always fearlessly maintained and will ever teach, though countless Imperial Parliaments, however powerful, declare the contrary, that "What God has joined together let not man put asunder," and "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another committeth adultery."

Shooting Straight

THE prompt action of the Governor of North Carolina recently prevented a lynching and saved some misguided fanatics from committing murder. His orders were simple. "Shoot and shoot straight if the mob attempts to murder your prisoner." The soldiers obeyed and no lynching took place.

Human life is a sacred thing. It cannot be taken at the will of the individual, it cannot be sacrificed by individual whim. It was breathed into being by a Creative Will and its term can be marked only by a Divine decree. My life is not my own to do with what I will, much less is the life of another mine to destroy. Because I fuse my misguided will with others and speak through the violence of mob action my crime of murder is none the less a crime.

It has been the shame of America that these very simple principles have often been forgotten. Racial prejudice has destroyed common sense and common justice and the black man has been killed time and again long before his guilt has been proved. Guilty or not he has been murdered, for this is what execution by lynch law means. In many instances the victim has been guilty. But his guilt must be proved and when proved his life can be taken by due process of law. The sovereign State has the right to take human life for definite crimes once guilt has been established. God Himself has sanctioned this right. Four thousand years of Jewry's history prove this. But God cannot sanction murder. And mob action is always murder, for there is intent to kill, by private authority. Whether the victim escapes or not, the members of the mob are murderers.

The lynching belt has not narrowed with the growth of our population. A survey of the last five years' lynching record proves that it has widened. And one very patent reason why it has widened is because law has walked with sluggish steps in hunting down mob murderers and it has not halted the murderer's hand by prompt action when the mob has sprung to the attack.

If every individual knew that "shooting straight" was the law's answer to the mob murderer, the mob spirit would soon die down and American lynching parties would melt away.

In his war message to the Central Powers the President declared that a great peace-loving people would use "force without stint or limit" to stay the onrush of an opposing force that reckoned neither right nor justice. It must be the determination of the same peace-loving people to use just force with the law's just instruments against those who under the sway of passion and prejudice sweep aside every element of justice, and take human life in the cowardly brutal methods of mob murder. The Governor of North Carolina acted well and he acted better by acting promptly.

Centralization and the Smith-Towner Bill

THE National Education Association, in convention assembled, pledges itself to resist all efforts to Federalize the local schools, with the same energy with which it labors for the enactment of the Smith-Towner bill. As this bill establishes a Federal domination over the local schools, it will be seen even by those who but glance as they gallop, that the Association has set itself a task of greater difficulty than the squaring of the circle.

Yet it is a point gained that the Association publicly acknowledges the danger of Federal domination. We are now agreed, all of us, that Federal control of the local schools is a condition incompatible with the Federal Constitution. By deliberate purpose, the framers of that instrument excluded the Federal Government from all power over schools which the people might find within the States. Consequently, all of us alike will range ourselves in opposition to any scheme which may clothe the Federal Government with any vestige of that power. We will oppose, the National Education Association with the rest of us, any plan requiring the States to submit, for any purpose whatsoever, their school laws, regulations, or programs, to any Federal officer. We will resist as a thing most dangerous to educational freedom, any standardizing agency established by the Federal Government, and vested with power, direct or indirect, to enforce its decisions within the States.

Above all, we will set our faces like flint against any and all plans which involve the payment of Federal grants to the respective States, on condition that the States conform to educational standards laid down by the Federal Government, functioning through a political appointee. For, as is obvious, any one of these plans would be fraught with great danger to the principle of local control of the local schools. A Federal Department, embracing them all, would destroy that principle. But all are contained in the Smith-Towner bill, together with the absurd proviso that the States shall retain exclusive control of the local schools after they have ascertained at Washington what particular degree of control a political ap-

pointee will permit them to retain. Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.

It is also fairly clear that certain fellows of the lewder sort are now attempting to drag religious controversy into this discussion. As their efforts betoken the mentality of a whirling dervish and all the generosity of a Mad Mullah, they will probably be disowned by well-meaning friends of the bill and, in any case, may be safely disregarded by its opponents. Happily, too, the National Education Association, whose voice is often as the voice of the three tailors of Tooley Street, can speak only for a small minority of our American school teachers. Despite the aspersions of Messrs. Claxton and Strayer, the great majority of these men and women are as loyal to their work, often under most distressing circumstances, as they are competent to perform it.

Body and Soul of Literature

THE beauty of the body is not identical with the beauty of the soul. The exterior may be fair to the eye, beautiful in the grace and symmetry of its parts; it may image for us the types of beauty that the Grecian sculptor immortalized in marble. The exterior may be all we could wish it to be; yet meanwhile "rank corruption" may be "mining all within." The body for all its attractiveness may be as a magnificent sepulcher, in which dead men's bones are rotting, even as the form and carriage and every bodily movement of the prodigal, in the heyday of his riotousness, may have shown forth beauty, while moral deformity and corruption worse, far worse, than the decay of the lily, were disfiguring his soul and swiftly transforming it into the image and likeness of an archangel ruined.

There is a body and a soul in literature. The thoughts that the essayist would communicate to his reader, the emotion that the poet would awaken in the hearts of others, the motives, the principles and the ideals that control the actions of the hero in the novel or the drama, and which, as we suppose, the novelist or dramatist would have us approve, these constitute the soul of literature. Felicity of expression, richness of imagery and tasteful discrimination in its selection, in a word all that makes for adequate and artistic expression of thought and feeling, is the body.

Is it impossible that in literature as in life the body should be fairer than the soul? The ideal no doubt would be found in the apt union of high moral excellence and physical beauty. In life we have had such an ideal union, in Him who combined the sanctity of the Godhead with a fairness that made Him "beautiful beyond the children of men." In a far lower, though still a high degree, many of His followers have by His favor possessed a body whose natural beauty was enhanced by the beauty of the soul that was reflected in the outward form. In literature, too, we have in the best works of the great masters, if not the ideal at least a close approach to the ideal union of

a beautiful soul and a beautiful body. But the two are by no means dissociable. Contemporary literature often presents a body that is fair to gaze upon; but how often is not that body like a whitened sepulcher? So it is when the thought of the essay is as false as the philosophy of which it is a partial exposition; or when the emotion of the poem and the principles advocated in the drama are such as no self-respecting pagan, let alone a Christian and a Catholic, could bring himself to extol or openly avow. Are we likely to behold in this generation or the next a greater than Shakespeare at his best, or even his peer; an essayist that will rival the acknowledged masters of the past; a novelist that will challenge comparison with the author of the "Newcomes"; a poet that Dante himself might envy and sin not?

Stupid Propaganda

AN English baronet brings a boat from the other side of the water, and engages in a race with an American "defender." It is a languid sort of performance. Although held in the immediate environments of the world's metropolis, it can draw no more than 6,000 people. New York baseball crowds of 30,000 are by no means uncommon. Yet that boat race is deemed important enough by several of the metropolitan dailies to deserve an account, copiously illustrated and garnished with cheap gossip, stretching over the greater part of the first three pages.

At the same time, a great public meeting is arranged in Madison Square Garden. The guest of the occasion is a man whose fame is world-wide, and whose activities have been so pronounced that even now they are very like to a thorn in the side of a leading European power. With him are the spiritual head of more than 1,000,000 citizens of the State of New York, and the chosen executive of a people rising into independence after seven centuries of political slavery. Fifteen thousand people crowd the great hall; almost as many are turned away for lack of accommodations. The prelates and the President speak with power and authority. Their message is of the deepest interest to millions of Americans. More than this, it is of international import. Yet the metropolitan press which could devote three pages to a trifling "international" boat-race, could find space only for a most miserably inadequate account of New York's reception to an apostle of freedom, the Archbishop of Melbourne.

Has the New York press so low an opinion of the intelligent people of the metropolis as to believe that they prefer the piffle of stupid propaganda to a reasonably full account of a meeting addressed by the prelates of New York and Melbourne, and the President of the Irish Republic? Undoubtedly it has that low opinion. That is why it has no more real influence, if indeed as much, than the associated wholesale dealers in coal. The people know that it is not "free." It may amuse them, or it may irritate them, but rarely, and only by accident, will it teach or guide them.

Literature

IS O. HENRY "THE AMERICAN MAUPASSANT"?

AN easy form of slovenly criticism consists in finding in every new author a second Poe, another Dickens, a new Tennyson, or a modern Rabelais. And so much modern criticism is done from the jackets or the table of contents of the books criticized that this convenient formula is a blessed life-saver to many a hard-pressed book reviewer.

As a sincere, dyed-in-the-wool, steadfast admirer of O. Henry, I was naturally caught by the phrase, "the American Maupassant." If France had its O. Henry, I wanted to meet him and that without delay. I had read, of course, "The Necklace" and the few harmless yarns contained in "The Odd Number," and in the first mentioned at least had recognized something of the technique which makes the stories of O. Henry such masterpieces of short-story construction; but beyond this trace of similar technique I could trace no further similarity.

Then across my vision with increasing insistence flashed the announcement that a complete Maupassant could be had for a sum that, small as it pretended to be, was still beyond my reach. The character of the advertisement was not one to attract the more conservative reader; it was crudely sensational, vulgarly loud, and stressing unduly the unpleasant word, "unexpurgated." But that in itself proved nothing; for the advertisements for O. Henry's works repel the lover of his clean, bright stories, suggesting, as these advertisements do, that there is much in these delightful yarns that the carrion type of mind may relish.

In a second-hand book store I ran across the set of Maupassant—\$1.25 for the whole shelf of them. It was a bargain not to be denied, and I bore them to my room, not without a feeling of triumph. Now I know better. The sum I paid for that set was exactly \$1.25 too much. Like the would-be kidnappers in O. Henry's "Ransom of Red Chief," I felt that the book-seller should have paid me to take it off his hands.

"The American Maupassant!" Call Clarence Underwood the American Durer, because both work in black and white; call Shakespeare the English George M. Cohan, because both wrote plays; or Galli Curci the Italian Al Jolson, because both sing. O. Henry the American Maupassant? Well, both wrote short-stories—but both of them ate breakfast, for that matter; and both slept in a bed, and probably both of them had friends, though I rather doubt it of Maupassant; and both may have had enemies, though I doubt that of O. Henry. But none of these things make O. Henry the American Maupassant or Maupassant the French O. Henry.

It is true that they have some externals of short-story technique in common. What two writers of short-stories so radically differ that it is not possible to find some points of similarity? Yet even in mere technique O. Henry is vastly the superior of his French predecessor. I waited and waited in vain, as I ploughed through that wasted \$1.25 worth, for another snap-finish which would equal or excel the one I had already become acquainted with in "The Necklace." Not one did I find. And I could find you in any volume of O. Henry a half-dozen that equal and two to five that surpass that much talked-of conclusion. I found less of compression, less of directness, less of the personal note, less of suspense and climax in the whole set of Maupassant than I could find in one volume of O. Henry. And when it came to a matter of content, emotion and character portrayal, comparison is simple insult. If two characteristics may be selected as marking off the works of O. Henry, they are sympathy as broad as "The Four Million" he loved, and a genial humor that vibrates in every line he wrote.

Let us take humor first, for that, certainly, we would expect

to find in a son of France. But not one gleam pervades the night-like gloom of those pages. Even the "error-shark" from Manewatabo, Minn., who finds the typographical error on page 624 of the mail-order catalogue, by diligent search with a dark lantern and a magnifying glass, could not find one smouldering spark of humor in those unrelieved pages of dun and drab. That unctuous humor of O. Henry, that delicate play of wit with its brain-stimulating crispness and its fresh grip on the most ancient and commonplace of jests, that healthy sense of the incongruous that laughs and loves even while it laughs, is so foreign to Maupassant that no sort of international code could ever hope to naturalize it. In place of the rising feeling of mirth and the gleeful chuckle that accompany an hour in O. Henry's company, we feel within ourselves an ever-deadening sense of gloom, of unrelieved despair, of hatred without pity, and scorn without compassion. The man who first called O. Henry the American Maupassant had possibly just a trace less humor in his make-up than Maupassant himself.

America loves O. Henry because of that generous-hearted sympathy that envelopes every figure that leaped from his pen. Each figure is so like us, you and me and the rest of us work-a-day mortals, that we feel almost as if the kindly smile with which he regards them he were extending to us as well. The shop-girl, the decayed gentleman, the bride on her honeymoon, the reformed bandit, the confidence man, the dweller in flats and on ranches, the common man in the streets and the supposedly less common man in the avenues, the cop on the beat, Maggie sighing for a "beau" and Sadie bending over the savory stew which needs only the third ingredient; all find in him a friend, sympathetic, understanding, a man whose heart was open even as was his purse. And for just that does America love him.

I do not know of any reason why France should love Maupassant. I sincerely hope that it does not. If Maupassant had a heart, he had carefully hidden it behind that absolutely objective attitude toward humanity in general which was Zola's boast and Balzac's and of the rest of those cold, mordant, pitiless, if self-appointed, critics of mankind. Judged by his stories, Maupassant neither loves nor trusts anyone, and sympathy of the broad O. Henry type is to him not so much as a name. The great "middle class" he hates with that peculiar hatred that comes so oddly to American ears. Fancy O. Henry hating the butcher who cut his chops or the druggist who kept the store in which he clerked as a youth! Maupassant sits a cold, unsympathetic onlooker at the wrecks of lives calculated to pierce the most brazen heart. He sees virtue betrayed, honor turned into dishonor, shame take its place where once stood high esteem, and all without a flicker. For not one of his characters has he the slightest sign of admiration and even less of love.

And this lack of sympathy, this relentless sitting in judgment on the pettiness of the world as he sees it, does not rise from any keen yearning to correct and improve. Maupassant, for all his criticism, must yield to O. Henry as an effective foe of human wrongs. In "Brickdust Row," "The Unfinished Story," "The Guilty Party," O. Henry strikes with a force and effectiveness that Maupassant never once reaches. Few men ever scorned and hated evil as did O. Henry; but few men ever drew so clean a line between the crime and the criminal. With Maupassant, on the contrary, it is a hatred that makes more of pettiness than of actual crime, that sears and flays the offender more often than the offense.

As a result of all this, one rises from his reading of O. Henry with an increased sympathy and love for his fellow-men. The world seems a better place, men more lovable than before. We

have seen with O. Henry the little pettinesses of human kind, but in spite of this we have seen with his eyes that there is true gold beneath. He, by some blessed trick, finds the good in every one he meets, even in the tramp, the outlaw, or the criminal at the gallows' edge, and toward that good he turns our grateful eyes. It is so easy to see defects and so hard to scrape through them to the goodness buried beneath encrusting layers.

How different this from our emotions after an hour with Maupassant! A good woman dies and we find that all the while she has lived an adulteress. A respectable man commits suicide because of some hidden horror in his past; a priest is found dead because his sins have found him out. Good, we think with a shudder, is only the thin veneer spread over the hidden depths of wickedness. If one of Maupassant's characters is respectable, be sure that he will be utterly, repulsively selfish; if he is frankly evil, he is fixed unrepentantly in his crime. One rises from Maupassant with a distrust for all mankind. Is there anyone whose guileless eyes we may look into and believe? Is there a friend who may not tomorrow thrust the knife between our ribs? What crime does that hearty laugh seek to hide? What sins lie buried in the heart of that sweetly smiling woman? Ugh! How Maupassant could have felt as his stories indicate him to have felt and still stayed in the midst of human kind is beyond the comprehension of an American mind.

France has been unfortunate in the authors popularized in America, and not least so in the case of Maupassant. No one has ever felt a noble emotion on reading him, and I doubt very much if anyone has ever been even momentarily entertained. And if fiction has for its purpose the reproduction of life as a whole, then Maupassant is no true man of letters. His view of life is untrue, misshapen, warped, completely one-sided. He does not put forth life as a whole; he puts forth the small, unhealthy section of life in which his morbid soul finds interest. To compare him with O. Henry the clean-hearted, broad-sympathied, whole-souled lover of all men, would be insulting if it were not so palpably ridiculous. And if the reader distrusts my views, let him listen to O. Henry, who once said: "I have been called the American de Maupassant. Well, I never wrote a filthy word in my life, and I don't like to be compared to a filthy writer."

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

REVIEWS

Finding a Way Out. An Autobiography. By ROBERT RUSSA MOTON. Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Co. \$2.50.

The Negro Faces America. By HERBERT J. SELIGMAN. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$1.75.

There is a simplicity about Dr. Moton's autobiography which almost disarms criticism. Still, since it is offered as "a contribution to the solution" of the Negro problem, a just appraisement of its value must disregard the personal element. It may be said at once that while the story is not without an element of interest, it is altogether valueless as a scientific presentation of our race-problem. Inviting comparison with the work of Booker Washington, the comparison vividly pictures the unhappy position of the mediocre man who tries to fill the place of a genius. Dr. Moton will certainly offend the progressive and "radical" elements among his own people, and will not particularly recommend himself to the old race of Southerners who know, or think they know, the black man. Washington, as it seems to me, counseled the Negro to go to work because useful work of any kind ennobles the worker. This the Negro did not understand. Centuries of slavery had taught him to regard all work as debasing. Dr. Moton, on the contrary, appears to counsel work, not so much for the sake of the individual, as because the manual labor of the Negro is an economic asset to "nice white gem'men in de No'th." His attitude is akin to that of some good old ante-bellum Uncle Tom with his rag of a hat

held humbly in a toil-gnarled hand, as the white man passes by. That attitude is not good for self-respect, and unless the Negro can gain in that attribute, he is lost.

Mr. Seligman plays on a harp of another set of strings, martial, defiant strings. To one who has known Negroes from his cradle upward, Mr. Seligman's understanding of the issue between white and black seems born of sentiment only. Granted that about ninety per cent of these race difficulties come from prejudice, prejudice is a reality and must be reckoned with. Any solution which disregards that prejudice, simply because men *oughtn't* to be prejudiced, will end in riot. Deep down in the consciousness of most whites, North quite as well as South, is the principle that the Negro is inferior, physically, mentally and morally. Perhaps this belief is the blankest of *unreasoning* prejudice; in any case, it is a fact. You cannot rid a man of prejudice by telling him to throw his prejudice away. That is precisely what he cannot do. And if you completely disregard his prejudice, you block the way to any satisfactory solution of the problem. The Negro *may* attain a plane of equality with the whites, by showing through his mental, moral and economic progress, that he is fit for it. He will never attain it by demanding it with a gun in his hand.

An interesting chapter is Mr. Seligman's discussion of the Negro and his vote. Before the war, the Negro counted as three-fifths of man in the apportionment of representation in Congress, and he had no vote. For all practical purposes he has no vote today either, but for all that he counts as five-fifths of man. Consequently, the South is heavily over-represented, or misrepresented, perhaps, in the Lower House. The South is particularly keen on the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment. The North might fitly retort by insisting on the enforcement of section 2 of the Fourteenth Amendment.

P. L. B.

The War, the World and Wilson. By GEORGE CREEL, \$2.00; **How We Advertised America.** By GEORGE CREEL, \$5.00. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Mr. Creel has here published a complete defense of the President. One of the few men associated with Mr. Wilson from the beginning of the war, he makes it plain that the President in his view was invariably right on questions that were to be decided for America's best interests. Hence we are told that no one since Lincoln has sensed the soul of America as accurately as Mr. Wilson and that his decisions have always been for the nation's interest as against political interest, that the President's mind is direct, his vision clear, and that he has suffered in popularity because he has refused to indulge in the dramatic or the sensational, and that for this reason he is considered reserved and aloof. We learn that he carried the war into the realm of idealism and would have crowned that idealism in the League of Nations but for the political hatred of his recalcitrant Congress. Perhaps no more ambitious attempt to vindicate Wilsonism has appeared in print since the campaign documents of 1916. What will Colonel Harvey say?

The work of the Committee on Public Information is told in Mr. Creel's second book. The battle for the mind of the world in the details of propaganda is described interestingly by the man at the head of the campaign that was waged not only with the pen but with poster, lecture, pamphlet and moving-picture; and not only at home but abroad, in Allied as well as in Enemy countries. The purpose of the Committee was to drive home to each individual in America the fact that all business was the nation's business, and every task a unit focused on a single purpose. Its foreign duty was to convince the Allied nations that America was with them to her last man and last gun, to assure the neutral nations that America was fighting for no selfish purpose, and to prove to the Central Powers that

American determination was linked with invincibility. The machinery employed in such a battle was powerful and Mr. Creel vividly portrays its detailed working. But his two volumes, appearing as they do just now, look dangerously like campaign documents and lose their historical value for that reason.

G. C. T.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

An Anti-Christian Novel.—Since the days of Voltaire many would-be wits who have lost along with their faith in Christianity, whatever good taste they once possessed, have been addicted to writing parodies on the Sacred Scriptures. For no kind of composition, perhaps, taxes the intellect less or wins more easily the applause of the irreverent and the foolish. The late Samuel Butler, whose Puritanical upbringing ended in making him a bitter hater of the Established Church, left behind him a novel called "Erewhon Revisited," which is a particularly offensive attack on revealed religion. For the author, besides parodying Holy Writ, tries to make ridiculous the greatest mysteries in Our Divine Lord's life by showing how an English adventurer called Higgs imitated them, and Butler even gives the anagrammatic name "Yram" to the "hero's" shameless mother. Yet this is the sort of novel that so reputable a publishing house as the E. P. Dutton Co. have thought it worth while to bring out in a new edition and that Moreby Acklom, in his introduction to this highly objectionable story, considers the work of a "great" man owing to the qualities of "service and usefulness in the kingdom of mind and morals" that he manages to discern in Butler's anti-Christian writings.

For Sociologists.—Dr. Philip Klein, the author of "Prison Methods in New York State, a Contribution to the Study of the Theory and Practice of Correctional Institutions in New York State" (Longmans) has drawn on first-hand sources, reports of institutions, legislative documents, supplemented by personal contact with prisons and prisoners. Since 1913 Dr. Klein has been secretary of the Prison Association of New York. This volume was to have been a part of a general treatise on the treatment of the criminal and the prevention of crime in New York State, but the war spoiled the original plan. The present book deals only with a history of prison methods from the days of the colony of New York to the present time.—Political history is well handled, as a rule, in Columbia University's "Studies in Political Science." The volume by Dixon Ryan Fox on "The Decline of Aristocracy in the Politics of New York" (Longmans) will prove of value to the student of that science. The period covered by the assistant professor of history at Columbia begins with the nineteenth century and closes with the noisy days of 1840. Its center is New York but the light it throws on the political history of those times is by no means local. The volume is well indexed and documented.

More Summer Fiction.—"The Golden Bird and Other Sketches" (Knopf, \$2.00), by Dorothy Easton, for which John Galsworthy writes the foreword, is from the pen of an observant Englishwoman with a distinctive literary gift, for she can paint in a few words a vivid picture of village life in England or of city life in France. The story which gives the book a title is about a bedridden young butler who joyfully entertains his fellow-servants. "Impossible" is a striking character-sketch of a would-be "lady's companion," and "For the Red Cross" and "The Unfortunate" are two of the collection's best-told stories.—"A Maker of Saints" (Dutton, \$2.50), Hamilton Drummond's new story, has for its central figure Marco Fieravanti, a thirteenth-century sculptor from Forli whose beautiful statues of Our Lady and the Saints have made him the pride of his countrymen. By the strange "custom of

Brettinoro" Marco becomes the guest of the fair and haughty Lucia's father and the sculptor's fate can then be accurately predicted. The author artistically draws the numerous minor characters in the story, develops the plot skilfully, introduces Dante with good effect, and gives so many stirring descriptions, as he proceeds, of medieval prelates, knights, bandits, etc., that the novel holds the reader's attention to the end.—"Wings of the Wind" (Small, Maynard), by Credo Harris, leads through many exciting episodes and hairbreadth escapes in the pursuit and recapture of the kidnapped princess of "Azuria." It is a story that will make pleasant recreation "for vacation" hours.—"Marian Frear's Summer" (Macmillan, \$1.75) is the title of Margaret Ashmun's story of an amiable country girl whose acquaintance with visiting city folk proves so profitable to her that she gains all her heart's desires. A good book for girls in their early teens.—The fifteen short-stories in Victor Bridges' "The Cruise of the Scandal" (Putnam, \$1.75) will furnish agreeable vacation reading. The two tales about the merry convicts are the best.

A Lost Catholic Poet.—Miss Louise I. Guiney, whose admirers justly complain that she has published in recent years, far too little, contributes to the July *Month* a most interesting inquiry into the Catholic antecedents and associations of John Donne, the seventeenth-century poet. The author maintains that Donne "wherever his utterance is devotional shows himself a child (and not a strayed child) of the old Church. . . . His poetry is never merely Anglican. Placed beside George Herbert, Donne looks like a medieval scholiast." After briefly describing the careers of the gifted and heroic ancestors, relatives and friends whose memory or society must have influenced the Catholic boyhood of Donne, Miss Guiney remarks:

What a pedigree of honor, and what a cluster of collaterals for John Donne, the man of letters! No one, surely, in his England was so destined to literature, or could count so many names of writers linked to him by blood or marriage as Blessed Thomas More, the two Rastells, the three Heywoods [two of whom were Jesuits, and the maternal uncles of Donne], "the unknown poet, Thomas Pridioxe," Anthony Copley, Richard Stanhurst, Father Southwell, and Cresacre, Edward Thomas, and Dame Gertrude More! Yet that which all this "chivalry of Christ" prized far beyond the glories of Helicon, John Donne found it in him to throw away.

At the conclusion of her little study the author quotes the following lines "from a monologue by Donne (not yet Dean) dating from the outset of his visit to Germany in 1619. But they might have come from a would-be Cistercian gliding happily and forever into his cloister":

I sacrifice this Iland unto Thee!
And all whom I lov'd here, and who love mee.
When I have put our seas twixt them and mee,
Put Thou Thy sea betwixt my sinnes and Thee.
As the trees sap doth seeke the roote below
In winter, in my winter now I goe
Where none but Thee, the eternal Roote
Of true Love, I may know.
Seale, then, this bill of my divorce to all
On whom those fainter beames of love did fall;
Marry those loves which in youth scatter'd bee
On Fame, Wit, Hopes (false mistresses!) to Thee.
Churches are best for prayer that have least light:
To see God only, I goe out of sight;
And to 'scape stormy dayes, I chuse
An everlasting night.

EDUCATION

The School Fight in Michigan

THE sponsors for the proposed amendment to the Michigan constitution, materially altering the present school law, succeeded in obtaining the requisite number of signatures to compel its submission to the voters at the November election. As

has been reported in a previous number of *AMERICA*, however, the attorney-general of the State ruled that the amendment not only attacks a system of schools which are of the highest value to the community, but also that it conflicts with the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution. In conformity with this opinion, the Secretary of State then refused to place the amendment on the ballot. It should be understood however, that this action does not end the matter. Court proceedings have already been initiated, to force the submission of the amendment to popular vote. The literal intent of the amendment has been stated in *AMERICA*. It would require attendance at the public schools in their own school district of all children between the ages of five and sixteen.

SOME EFFECTS OF THE AMENDMENT

THE supporters of this nefarious proposition may openly make statements that deceive the gullible voter about "Americanization," "true democracy," "an easier enforcement of the compulsory attendance laws," things in themselves desired by all; but the real aim of the petitioners is, however, readily recognized by the thinking people of Michigan. Very emphatic letters in opposition to the amendment have recently been published in the Detroit *Free Press*. A communication dated June 16, is from Edward Denby of Detroit, former member of Congress and a war veteran. A letter addressed by F. B. Leland to the Rev. F. R. Frinke of Monroe, appears in the *Free Press* for June 22. Mr. Leland has been active in educational matters in Michigan for many years, has served on the Board of Regents for the State university for more than twelve years, and at present is seeking the Republican nomination for governor. Both men are Protestants. They wholeheartedly condemn this measure on moral, constitutional, and economic grounds.

Whatever the avowed design of the amendment supporters, their real purpose is to weaken the Catholic Church by crushing the parish school. That it would eliminate other denominational schools, as well as those private schools classed as non-sectarian, is recognized. While this may be lamented by a few, they are not thereby deterred from their attack on positive Christianity. They assume, it would appear, that there is no menace quite equal to Catholicism, and whatever suffering or inconvenience might be caused others should be generously forgiven and forgotten in this great onslaught against the Catholic Church. In their zeal they would rival the old political "Barn Burners" of New York. Again anti-Catholic fanatics are acting on the principle that the end justifies the means.

It is evident that if the amendment should be adopted by popular vote, not only would Catholic, Protestant, and secular private schools be closed, but also our State schools for delinquents, the blind, the deaf, and other unfortunates and defectives. With these would go the technical and art schools. If a child lived in a school district with an inferior public school, its parents could not send the child outside of that district for its education. Orphanages and reformatories for juvenile delinquents would also be forced to close.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

ALTHOUGH the issue is primarily moral, its economic consequences cannot be entirely overlooked. Mr. Leland estimates that not less than 125,000 children in this State attend parochial and private schools. He continues: "If schools of this character throughout the State were closed, in many localities it would be impossible for a long time to provide school room accommodations. The passing of the proposed amendment would cause the practical destruction of over \$100,000,000 of property now used for school purposes in the State. Building the new schools required at public expense would cause an enormous increase in taxes."

That Catholic parish schools are performing their duties well, is a fact clearly recognized by Protestant educators. In the

matter of studies, reports required by law, cooperation in the enforcement of compulsory attendance laws, the officials of the parish schools are the equals of the officials of the public schools. Any county school commissioner in Michigan will verify this statement. Governor Sleeper, the present State executive, has often spoken in the highest terms of the moral and educational worth of our Catholic schools.

A CONFLICT FOR DEMOCRACY

MY observations convince me that many non-Catholics are but vaguely aware of the menace that this amendment brings. They realize that it is aimed at the Catholic schools, but since they are not interested either in the success or failure of these schools, they assume an attitude of indifference. When they are brought to a realization that it would destroy many Protestant schools, technical schools, and even institutions for defectives and delinquents, they will awake from their lethargy. In this matter Catholics should to a greater extent seek the active cooperation of intelligent Protestants. It is a problem in the solution of which all true Americans should be able to coordinate their efforts. Jews and non-believers, unless atheists, should not fail to see that their own interests would not be furthered by such legislation.

The Soviet Ark did not carry to the shores of Russia men and women who were more dangerous to our institutions and to the welfare of our republic than the backers of this iniquitous amendment. Even if the courts should direct the submission of the proposed amendment to a popular vote in November, there is no reason to believe that it would pass. Great mischief would be done, however, by the ill-will that would be aroused. If by accident, such an amendment should receive a popular majority, it would still be unconstitutional. It is to be hoped in the interest of mutual good will among the citizens of Michigan, that it will not come to a vote. Never has any proposition been submitted to the voters of this State that has in it the potentialities for evil that lurk in this proposed school amendment.

R. H. BALDWIN.

SOCIOLOGY

Was Adam a Cave Man?

THE first man was not a savage. This is clear from the whole course of history in which no savage race has ever risen unaided into civilization. The evidence of archeology, too, is as plainly against it as are the words of Sacred Scripture. Yet in saying that primitive man was certainly not a savage we do not by any means wish to imply in his case even the beginning of an advanced stage of material civilization. The helplessness of the first human pair after their fall could not be better expressed than in the Scripture statement that a Divine intervention was needed mercifully to supply them even with their necessary and befitting clothes. They were now going forth to face the inclemencies of an earth that was to bring forth thorns and thistles, that was to abound for them in hardships and sufferings, and that, after much labor, might at times yield them but a scanty subsistence.

To say that Adam, for a time at least, may have lived the life of a cave man may at first thought sound startling to Catholic ears. Yet it is the only thing to expect. Clothed in the garments of skin, with the sentence of God upon them, the first man and woman, of necessity felt the consequences of sin. Whither could they turn, except to some hospitable cave which might afford them shelter from the storms that shook the ancient oaks above them, or from the cold dews and the chill frosts of the night.

Had Adam been gifted with all the genius of a Newton and a Shakespeare combined—and it is not in the least impossible that such may have been the case—yet the vast possibilities of bronze and iron would still have been hidden from him except

for a Divine revelation. In calling attention to the use of iron only at a far later date, the Scripture is in perfect accord with science. Or rather we should express it the reverse way; for while scientific facts can stand unchallenged, without further confirmation, scientific theories can have no better commendation of their plausibility than their accordance with the Inspired Word.

THE FIRST STONE AGE

A STONE implement is all that Adam could naturally have fashioned, and this only with the greatest difficulty, and probably in the very crudest way. He was serving his sentence, and we do not therefore presume that any very extraordinary assistance was given him, such as would have been accorded in Paradise, though we cannot, of course, say what knowledge may have been brought with him from there. It is true that even in exile, his mind and his heart may have been in closest communion with his Creator. His thoughts may have penetrated deeper and reached farther than our own. Yet the making of a bronze spearhead would still have been entirely beyond the wildest flights of his imagination, as the possibility of a gleaming steel needle would have remained undreamed of by Eve as she tried a hundred devices to fashion her garments of untanned skins.

Above all we must understand that no need was then felt of things that now seem to us so indispensable. The loftier the mind, in fact, of our first progenitors, the less they probably concerned themselves with providing for more than the merest needs and simple comforts of the body. Yet the attainment of even this much often taxed their utmost ingenuity.

MORAL AND PHYSICAL STRUGGLES

WHAT was it, in fine, that the Fall implied? "The break-up of human beatitude," Father Joseph Rickaby, S. J., replies, "the loss for Adam and his posterity of sanctifying grace and consequently of the entry into heaven and of the Vision of God; the loss of immunity from concupiscence, from sickness and from death; the loss of a high knowledge of the things of God, of familiarity with God." But this was not all. The lower animals no longer rendered him ready obedience, and the primitive earth refused him subsistence, except as the reward of hard toil. Coming to describe in fewest words the consequences that actually followed, the same writer thus traces the course of history, in full conformity with all that we know through both scientific and documentary sources:

The losses were all of privileges supernatural, not due to human nature as such. Man's nature was left entire. But it was left entire much in the way that a man, stripped of his clothes, and suddenly thrown out of a warm room into the street, may be said still to have his entire nature. Human nature, after the Fall, was left at a great disadvantage, moral and physical. Man found himself in a novel situation for which he was not destined and was quite unprepared. Morally he had to struggle with the passions of his own nature, prone to evil, physically he had to wrest a livelihood from external nature and defend himself from manifold dangers of death.

Though God's help was never wanting, many succumbed to these struggles through their own fault. "The wickednesses of men," the Scripture tells us, "were multiplied upon the earth." The abominations of paganism that followed in the wake of man's transgressions are sufficiently familiar. But physically, too, the story can be briefly told: "As Adam's children multiplied upon the earth, the overplus of the population was thrust out into the ruder and less favored climates, food was hard to get, savage animals were many, and, naturally enough, man became savage as well as his surroundings." In this, and other ways, savagery arose, following also in the wake of sin and the consequence of it. Here then is a picture that accounts scientifically no less than religiously for the facts that paleontology, archeology and history teach.

EARLIEST OCCUPATIONS AND THE FIRST CITY

PASTORAL and agricultural occupations, as economists state and history exemplifies, would in the course of time engage the attention of primitive man. Obviously it could not have been long before Adam and Eve would have attempted these forms of more permanently providing for themselves and their offspring, perhaps after their first severe struggles with nature. The power over the animal world which they had once possessed, and the Divine injunction, even in the Paradise of pleasure, to busy themselves enjoyably in it, "to dress it, and to keep it," naturally would have suggested to them this course. But Adam was now to earn his bread in the sweat of his brow, and Eve was to feel the sorrow as well as the joy of giving birth. The fact is that we are soon definitely informed of the practice of both pastoral and agricultural pursuits: "Abel was a shepherd, and Cain a husbandman." So Scripture again bears out our most advanced economic knowledge.

Of Cain we are told that "he built a city, and called the name thereof by the name of his son, Henoch." But of what kind this city was Scripture does not enlighten us. The most primitive concept of a rudely contrived shelter probably sufficed for these early builders. The erection of a roofed habitation would naturally enough have suggested itself even to Adam. A few poles and twigs, with mud for plaster, may have been sufficient for Cain's own palace. There were no Greek architraves or Gothic arches, with sculptured figures. In vain would the archeologist now search for it, when even the mighty walls of Babylon are crumbled to the dust. And yet it is with a true civilization, and not with savagery or barbarism that we are dealing. To gage civilization, as has been the custom, by the implements that men used, and so to grade it in an ascending scale with the stone age, the newer stone age, the bronze age and the iron age, is entirely arbitrary. Moreover all these ages have from a very early period existed simultaneously in different parts of the earth down to the most recent times.

MEN OF THE OLD STONE AGE

HERE precisely is the confusion that exists in the mind of our modern scientists. They cannot dissociate the two ideas of purely material comforts, which may be combined with real savagery at heart, and a high stage of all that is really supremely valuable in truly civilized life. Whether dwelling in the modern cliff habitations, the sixteen or sixty-story buildings of our huge cities, not seldom amid the most unnatural and often the most immoral conditions, cribbed, cabined and confined in small rooms and narrow streets, or, perhaps, meeting all the necessities of life in a more primal simplicity, as Adam certainly did, "A man's a man for a' that." Even when wandering away from the centers of their earlier Eastern civilization, and at times declining more and more to a level with their savage surroundings, we still find Adam's later descendants covering the walls of the caverns in which they gathered for shelter, protection or worship, with artistic etchings that excite our wonder. In the Cueva de la Vieja, belonging to the old Stone Age, women are portrayed with long gowns descending from their bosoms. There are animated pictures of life, of the chase and war in this same marvelous Alpera fresco, dating back to the co-called Reindeer period, formerly synonymous with "primitive savagery."

There is devolution and evolution at every stage. Here again the Scripture narrative perfectly bears out the facts of history. The existence of savagery in every period, shortly after the Creation itself, is readily explained from the Sacred Record. The first man and woman transgressed the law of their Creator; the second man proved to be a murderer. The causes of degradation were therefore present from the beginning. They began with the first sin, and they continued in an accelerated ratio until the deluge, when we find them beginning anew with Cham. Hence the explanation for the prevalent idolatry that followed.

and the wide-spread decline, moral, intellectual and cultural, reaching in many instances to that state of degeneracy and degradation known as savagery. Out of such a stage no historic nation has ever been known to rise to civilization unaided. Adam may for a time have been a cave man, he could never have been a savage. Such is the evidence of archeology and history as well as of the Sacred Scriptures.

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN, S. J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Jewish Philanthropic Societies' Report

THE *American Israelite* informs its readers that in New York 238 men and women have contributed more than \$1,000 each for the support of Jewish philanthropic societies during the past year. The editor remarks:

This list forms an interesting index to the support of Jewish philanthropy in this city. Approximately 30,000 names appear on this list, the contributions for which they are pledged range from one dollar to \$100,000. Thirty-eight hundred persons give less than ten dollars annually and 250 give more than \$1,000. The total of all contributions is approximately \$300,000,000, three-fourths of the total sum required for the support of the ninety-one prominent philanthropic institutions that are affiliated with Federation and supplied with funds by it. Every street in New York is represented on the list of donors, and every borough of Greater New York, and all of the Long Island, Westchester, and New Jersey suburbs.

While the institutions which belong to the Jewish Federation are located in and around New York, and function chiefly among the sick and needy of the metropolis, the list of annual contributors to Jewish charities contains names of residents of other cities and in fact of other countries.

The Report of the Association of the Holy Childhood

A NEW record has been made by the American branch of the Association of the Holy Childhood during the year ending April 30, 1920. The following figures show the annual increase in receipts since 1913 when the grand total amounted to \$27,019.00: 1914, \$41,446.92; 1915, \$55,760.63; 1916, \$67,147.08; 1917, \$82,525.53; 1918, \$119,827.70; 1919, \$140,175.51. The number of missions supported by the Association is at present 290. The funds of the Association are employed in procuring Baptism for pagan infants in danger of death, in buying children condemned to death or slavery, and in providing for their maintenance and Christian education. The Association was founded in 1843, and is the only general Foreign Mission society approved and indulged by the Holy See for the particular purpose of saving abandoned pagan children by the prayers and alms of Catholic children the world over.

The Indian Massacre Condemned in the House of Commons

A SPECIAL cable to the Philadelphia *Inquirer* recently reported that:

General Dyer's massacre of hundreds of unarmed and unwarmed natives, including women and children, at Jallianwalla Bagh; his refusal to succor the wounded or permit the dead to be buried; his orders that natives should crawl on all-fours through certain streets; the public whipping of natives, including a wedding party—were justified and approved by Sir Edward Carson and 129 British members of Parliament in the House of Commons last evening, as proper and necessary method of retaining the British hold on India.

About 256 members supported the Government view that his actions were not proper or necessary, but, on the contrary, improper, as being impolitic.

The London papers editorially commented on the action of Commons. The *Morning Post* gave the Carsonite view in an editorial entitled "Nothing Lost Save Honor." The other London dailies editorially held the position that it would have been unwise for the Government to have sanctioned Dyer's

action, seeing how large the Moslem population is under the British flag. The Indian massacre was chronicled in the pages of *AMERICA* a year ago. Several months later the hideous story was retold by the secular press.

The Daughters of Isabella and Girls' Clubs

A MOVEMENT of national import has been launched by the Daughters of Isabella. At the instance of their Supreme Regent, Mrs. Genevieve Walsh, this national organization of Catholic women has determined to dot the country with Girls' Clubs. It is planned to have each of the 540 courts of the Order or where the courts are not large enough to have a group of courts support a girls' club. Bishop Schinner of Spokane recently dedicated the girls' club of the Washington court. The structure cost \$15,000 and has many distinctive features including a library of 500 volumes. It provides girls with dormitory accommodations at five dollars a month and board at one dollar a day. While primarily intended for Catholic girls non-Catholics may share the dormitory and board privileges. It is the intention of the Daughters of Isabella to do for Catholic girls what non-Catholic organizations have done in different parts of the country.

Smith-Towner Bill in the South

IN view of the party's principles and traditions, many Democrats, North and South, were surprised to read in their national platform what is practically an endorsement of the Smith-Towner bill. That staunch Southern Democratic newspaper, the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, thus comments on a curious situation:

This must have got into the draft of the platform at the fag end of the committee's labors when its members were worn out by the long ordeal through which they had passed. It is safe to say it was given little thought when it reached them in the flood of other propositions which submerged them.

Under the lead of Senator Blair, a Republican, a long and stubborn fight for that scheme was made in Congress years ago, and the Democrats of that day, true to their party creed, did their part nobly to defeat the undertaking. It is anomalous to see an attempt now to revive it in a Democratic platform. In that platform, as in the Chicago platform, there are few questions dealt with requiring a reference to fundamental party principles; but this question of Federal aid to education is one of the few, and it is strange to see what has been heretofore properly regarded as a Democratic heresy now advocated as a Democratic duty.

Aside from any consideration of party principle, such a proposition at this time is in marked inconsistency with the avowed purpose of the party to effect imperative economy in Government expenditures and to reduce oppressive taxation. The profession of such a purpose certainly cannot be strengthened by accompanying it with a new plan like this to add to the present expenditures that of untold millions for Federal eradication of illiteracy and increase of teachers' salaries. (July 5, 1920.)

The Louisville *Post*, an independent newspaper, approves this opposition to federalization of the schools, in an editorial on July 9:

The *Courier-Journal* is exactly right in what it says of the dangers of the plan of "Federal aid for State schools." The States should aid their own schools and aid them liberally. The *Evening Post* has been a pioneer in the movement for larger expenditures for schools, including larger salaries for school teachers. But the moment a community stops taxing itself for education and turns to the Federal treasury for relief an orgy of log-rolling commences. It is a bad idea. The less the Federal Government has to do with such local matters as education the better for everyone, including, we may say, the Federal taxpayer.

Here are words from which our Southern brethren may extract counsels of wisdom. And does the South pine for a return of the days under the Freedman's Bureau?